THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

Vol. 13 JULY, 1938 No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Humor of Corporal Nym ..... *John W. Draper* 131

W. S. Gilbert and Shakspere ..... *E. P. Vandiver, Jr.* 139

Macbeth and *Paradise Lost* ..... *Grant McColley* 146

The New Cambridge Shakspere and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *S. A. Tannenbaum* 151

Proverbs and *Sententiae* in the Plays of Shakspere ..... *Katherine Lever* 173

Shakspere's Philosophical Patterns ..... *Robert M. Smith* 184

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS ..... *S. A. Tannenbaum* 188

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE HUMOR OF CORPORAL NYM

By JOHN W. DRAPER

"SLICE, I say! pauca, pauca; slice! that's my humor."[1] These are the first words of Corporal Nym when he first appears in Shakspere's *Merry Wives.* The conventions of Elizabethan drama required that the keynote of a character be struck when the audience first meets him; and Corporal Nym's initial words express the three chief facets of his personality: as a soldier, he declares that he will stab any who affront him, even as he now threatens to "slice" young Slender; in emulation of Parson Evans' "pauca verba" some ten lines earlier, he cries out "pauca, pauca," meaning to say that he is a man of great deeds rather than idle words; and further to support his nice pretentions to the gentility of arms, he indulges in the fashionable malady of a "humor"—that is in a superabundance of one of the four bodily fluids, a superabundance that was then supposed to affect both the physique and the mental life of the sufferer, sometimes even to the point of death or madness. Thus does the worthy Corporal, in the very first line he speaks, announce his dashing bravery, his ominous silence, and the elegant affliction of a "humor," though which of the four humors he does not specify.

Nym ought to be important. He is the last of Falstaff's followers to appear; and his introduction, therefore, should have some special point. Indeed, his part occurs in only the two final plays of the Falstaff series, in *Merry Wives* and *Henry V:* in the former, he warns Page and Ford of the fat knight's machinations against their wives, and so arouses Ford's jealousy,[2] and so prepares the way for Falstaff's *contretemps* which form the centre of the plot; in the latter, he helps to supply the background of the war, and he voices the King's reasons for the casting off of Falstaff.[3] Despite this importance, however, in plot and setting and theme, Nym speaks in both plays together fewer than eighty lines: apparently, he lives up to his initial declaration of "pauca, pauca"; and, as if to emphasize this trait

[1] *Merry Wives,* I, i, 119-120.
[2] *Ibid.,* I, iii, 68 *et seq.;* and II, i, 115 *et seq.*
[3] *Henry V,* II, i, 118-19 and 122-23.

still more, when he has made his final exit, still talking of "good humors" and "bad humors," Falstaff's "Boy" Robin once more reminds the audience of his laconic disposition, and suggests the reason for it:

> For Nym, he hath heard [from Evans?] that men of few words are the best [bravest] men; and therefore he scorns to say his prayers, lest he should be thought a coward: but his few bad words are matched with as few good deeds; for he never broke any man's head but his own, and that against a post when he was drunk.[4]

Nym's mannered silences beget, when he breaks these silences, a mannered speech. His words are few and precious —indeed, so precious that Page calls him "a drawling, affecting rogue," and declares that he "frights English out of his [its] wits."[5] In short, the brevity of Nym's colloquial style is purposefully calculated as an adjunct to his apparent martial prowess; and the few verbal airs and graces that his clipt talk permits likewise express his hopeful aspiration to the elegant gentility of his military betters. Nym, indeed, for all his silences, would like to fancy himself a master at persiflage: when Bardolph becomes tapster at the tavern, Nym applauds his new vocation as appropriate; for truly (says Nym) Bardolph "was [be-]gotten in drink."[6] Apparently this *mot* is beneath the laughter of the company; and Nym, seeing his witticism fall flat, calls on the others to admire his neat whimsey; but he calls in vain. The Falstaff *coterie* was used to better joking.

Perhaps Nym's terse style and feeble jocularity are only an expression of his "humor"; for a humor might reveal itself in speech as well as in action and bodily state, and Nym's humor was pervasive. In *Merry Wives,* he repeats the word in almost every line he speaks; and in *Henry V,* it appears in his talk nine times. His use of it, to be sure, is so loose as to be "often meaningless;"[7] and one almost wonders whether he knew just what a "humor" was. He never states, moreover, just which of the four humors supposedly afflicts him; and the present study, therefore, will attempt a diagnosis of his case.

Nym can hardly be a sufferer from too much blood. The

[4]*Henry V,* III, ii, 34 *et seq.*
[5]*Merry Wives,* II, i, 125 *et seq.*
[6]*Ibid.,* I, iii, 21.
[7]*Merry Wives,* ed. Furnivall, London, 1908, 149.

sanguine type of man was supposed to be handsome[8] and generally fortunate:[9] if Nym is handsome, the play does not imply it; and his ill-fortune is obvious in his squalid way of life and his miserable end, hanged by the neck for stealing.[10] Moreover, he is certainly not "honest . . . just, true, benevolent, liberall, faithful, milde, godly, shamefast, magnanimous, religious . . ."[11] Romeo, in his love for Juliet, exemplifies the sanguine type;[12] and Nym is no Romeo.

Pistol describes Nym—perhaps he meant it for mere compliment—as the Mars of malecontents;"[13] and the "malecontent" type was often associated with "melancholy,"[14] the disease that arose from too much black bile in the system. This type was under the malific astral influence of Saturn;[15] and this would agree with Nym's untimely end; and Nym's "few words"[16] would also be proper to it, but this sparsity of speech was assumed rather than natural; and his other symptoms hardly accord with this disease. Despite his being "troth-plight" to Dame Quickly, he is no Count Orsino suffering from love-melancholy.[17] Nor has he the religious melancholy of the Puritans: there is nothing Puritan[18] about him! He does not appear to experience "Passions and Perturbations of the Mind."[19] Indeed, he is neither a Jaques nor a Hamlet.[20]

Nym, as a soldier, certainly should be under the influence of Mars: did not Pistol call him "the Mars of malecontents"? And those whose nativity placed them under this sign of the zodiac were supposed to suffer from too much yellow bile and so were of a choleric disposition. This type was given to "chyding . . . fighting, murther, robbery, sedition;"[21] they were "angry, prompt of wit, nimble, incon-

---

[8]C. Dariot, *Iudgement of the Starres,* tr. Wither, London, 1578, sig. D 2 v.

[9]L. Lemnie, *Touchstone of Complexions,* tr. Newton, London, 1581, leaves 86 v and 87 v; *Batman upon Bartholome,* London, 1582, leaf 30 r.

[10]*Henry V,* IV, iv, 71.

[11]Dariot, *op. cit.,* sig. D 2 v.

[12]See the present author, "Shakespeare's Star-Crossed Lovers," to appear.

[13]*Merry Wives,* I, iii, 9.

[14]See E. E. Stoll, *M.P.,* III, 282 *et seq.*

[15]Dariot, *op. cit.,* sig. D 2 r; and C 4 v.

[16]*Ibid.,* D 2 r.

[17]Perhaps his malady is assumed.

[18]R. Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy,* Part III, Sec. iv.

[19]*Ibid.,* Part I, Sec. ii, 3.

[20]See the present author, "Hamlet's Melancholy," *Ann. Med. Hist.,* IX N. S., 142-147; and G. A. Bieber, *Der Melancholikertypus Shakespeares,* Heidelberg, 1913.

[21]Lemnie, *op cit.,* leaf 23 v.

stant;"[22] and the humor was appropriate to "all warriers, brawlers, contumelious, . . . quarrellers, theeues . . ."[23] Such is the aged Lear.[25] But Nym, though more obviously a "warrier," is neither a Tybalt nor a Lear; and he is certainly not "prompt of wit," for all his wishful thinking.

Indeed, Nym in reality is no more a soldier than he is a master of repartee. He has little of a soldier's sense of honor and nothing of a soldier's bravery; and one even wonders whether his title of Corporal was not purely an assumption. He does, to be sure, refuse to play pander for Falstaff, and declares that he "will keep the havior of reputation"[26] and that he would rather be honest than eat;[27] but, in carrying out these worthy sentiments, he is not quite Cæsar's wife. He may flaunt a fine virtue in refusing to carry Falstaff's seductive letter; but, in his own affairs of the heart, he would seem to the Elizabethans pusillanimous. He was "troth-plight"[28] to the middle-aged but well-to-do Dame Quickly, whose affection Falstaff had apparently bequeathed him; but Pistol, with his pseudo-courtly graces, had of a sudden wooed and won the lady, and had, moreover, cheated Nym of a gambling debt of eight shillings; and even worse, when the latter bellowed for revenge, Pistol suggested that he "espouse" instead the "lazar kite" Doll Tearsheet. Surely all this should make a soldier fight; but Nym, after drawing his sword and returning it once or twice and threatening (quite soldier-like!) to stab Pistol " in fair terms" while he slept, is utterly mollified by the promise of the eight shillings and the threats of Lieutenant Bardolph: he shakes hands, and starts off for the wars, he and Pistol now "Yoke-fellows in arms."[29] Indeed, for all his bluster, he will on occasion "carry coals,"[30] i.e., endure affronts.

Not only in his personal affairs but also in the exercise of his profession, Nym's bravery is indeed predominantly

---

[22]*Most Excellent Booke of Arcandam,* tr. Warde, London, 1592, sig. M 2 r.
[23]Dariot, *op. cit.,* sig. D 3 r.
[24]*Romeo and Juliet,* III, i, 150-51.
[25]L. B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes,* Cambridge, 1930, Chap. xiv.
[26]*Merry Wives,* I, iii, 75.
[27]*Ibid.,* II, i, 115 *et seq.*
[28]*Henry V,* II, i, 19.
[29]*Ibid.,* II, iii, 54.
[30]*Ibid.,* III, ii, 44-45. Cf. [Jones],*Booke of Honor and Arms,* London, 1590, Bk. II, Chap. i.

bluster; and he acts more like a roisterer of contemporary London than like a *bona fide* soldier. He first appears in *Merry Wives* roaring down Slender's accusations of thievery. Slender says that he is one of Falstaff's "cony-catching rascals;"[31] and Falstaff later admits himself "damned in hell for swearing" to his friends that Nym and Pistol are "good soldiers and tall [brave] fellows."[32] The Corporal himself declares that his sword is good, chiefly for toasting cheese; and his favorite weapon is a knife, when his enemy is asleep.[33] When he goes to the French wars, he remarks that he has but a single life,[34] and so had better cherish it; and indeed, he does no fighting. Robin declares that he "never broke any man's head but his own, and that against a post when he was drunk";[35] Robin, to be sure, also says that he is braver than poor Pistol;[36] but that is no compliment; and Nym himself admits that he "dare not fight" Pistol.[37] Indeed, the worthy Corporal, on a close inspection, has little in common with Shakspere's description of the proper soldier type:

> Jealous in honor, sudden and quick in quarrel,
> Seeking the bubble reputation . . .[38]

Why, then, did Nym frequent the wars? Pistol replies for both himself and his confederate:

> Let us to France; like horse-leeches, my boys,
> To suck, to suck, the very blood to suck![39]

Army life in that age was on the lowest plane: officers stole the soldiers' pay; and thus even actual soldiers in the midst of a campaign were obliged to loot the countryside, whether friendly or not, for the bare necessities of life;[40] and, in peacetime, "yong Souldiers" were left to "beg in the streets;"[41] the government was done with them, and the guilds closed most honest callings. Many ruffians, moreover, pretending to have "trailed a pike in Flanders," blus-

---

[31]*Merry Wives,* I, i, 113-114.
[32]*Ibid.,* II, ii, 8 *et seq.*
[33]*Henry V,* II, i, 4 *et seq.*
[34]*Ibid.,* III, ii, 3.
[35]*Ibid.,* III, ii, 38-40.
[36]*Ibid.,* IV, iv, 69-70.
[37]*Ibid.,* II, i, 6.
[38]*As You Like It,* II, ii, 151-52. Cf. Digges, *Foure Paradoxes,* London, 1604, 17.
[39]*Henry V,* II, iii, 55-56.
[40]See the present author, "Sir John Falstaff," *R. E. S.,* VIII, 414 *et seq.*
[41]*Cyuile and Vncyuile Life* (*ed. princ.,* 1579) *in Inedited Tracts,* ed. Hazlitt, Roxb. Lib., London, 1868, 26.

tered their way to a doubtful living in the dives of contemporary London; and Nym was apparently one of these. Indeed, most editors in the last two centuries have followed Rowe in describing him, along with Bardolph and Pistol, as "sharpers attending on Falstaff;"[42] and yet there is a difference between Nym and these other two: Nym was the most proficient thief, Bardolph was "too open," and on this account Falstaff had to sacrifice him to the honest trade of tapster,[43] and Pistol, according to Robin, was too cowardly.[44] Lieutenant Bardolph gives at least some appearance of courage in the war,[45] and so was probably an actual, though disreputable soldier; and Pistol, with his fine braggadocio phrases, may well have had some education, and perhaps had known the outskirts of the court;[46] but Nym is a born thief: his name, which means *take* or *steal,* declares as much; and his ability to instruct Robin in the master-craft of picking pockets,[47] a highly skilled profession, suggests an early start and long years of training in the underworld. He boasts, moreover, doubtless from experience, that he can lead any "nuthook," i.e., policeman, a merry chase;[48] truly, he and Bardolph are "sworn brothers in filching;"[49] and, in the end, their peccadilloes get them hanged.[50] One suspects that the bad technique that occasioned this sad *finale* was Bardolph's and not Nym's. Nym, therefore, was really a pickpocket who used the guise of soldier to cover his real craft.

Nym was no more a soldier than he was a wit; and his introduction in *Henry V,* Shakspere's most chauvinistic play, forms the sharpest, ironic contrast to the tone of the main plot. But if Nym's righteous wrath over the loss of Mistress Quickly was not so eaily assuaged, and if his military prowess evaporated so readily in war, how authentic are these symptoms as evidence of his choleric disposition? Nym, in short, is a sort of negative malingerer; and, for the convenience of the time, assumes a choler though he has it not. He is no more suffering from a superfluity of yellow

---

[42]See *Merry Wives,* Dram. Person.
[43]*Ibid.,* I, iii, 23 *et seq.*
[44]*Henry* V, IV, iv, 69-70.
[45]*Ibid.,* III, ii, i.
[46]See D. C. Boughner, "Pistol and the Roaring Boys," *Shak. Assoc. Bull.,* XI, 226.
[47]*Henry V,* III, ii, 45-46.
[48]*Merry Wives,* I, i, 150-51.
[49]*Henry V,* III, ii, 43.
[50]*Ibid.,* IV, iv, 71.

bile than he is from too much blood or too much atrabilious humor. Is, then, his "humor" entirely pretense; and is he in fact enjoying the good health that came from a perfect balance of the four essential fluids? Or did Shakspere repeat the word merely to satirize Ben Jonson and his "comedy of humors?"[51] What is the fact beneath his military camouflage?

The cold, phlegmatic type of man was given to "slouth;"[52] he was supposed to be "nothing quicke [lively]," and had a dull wit and base courage;[53] he was fat and soft and of a bad complexion.[54] Batman describes him as slow, dull, forgetful, soft of flesh and fearful;[55] and Dariot adds that such were young men, "luxurious [immoral], given to idlenes and pleasures . . . and lusts,"[56] and elsewhere terms them "thoughtful, unstable vacabounds, fearefull, faynt-harted, prodigall . . . commanding, common people . . . walking from place to place . . . laborious fooles, delighting in iournies and varietie of life . . ." [57] Nym certainly has a dull wit and base courage; his time is given to "idlenes and pleasures" such as Dame Quickly's notorious house affords; he is a "vacabound," and when his means allow, doubtless a "prodigall;" he clearly sprang from the "common" people; and his rank of Corporal reflects his desire, if not ability, to command; his foray into France shows him "delighting in iournies and varietie of life": and his very "drawling" speech,[58] if it be not another mere affectation, suggests the slow, phlegmatic temperament; and possibly shakspere meant dramatic irony in Nym's reiterated "humor"; for, while the Corporal boasted his choleric truculence, the actual sordid fact was the phlegmatic dullness of the soft and dastard sloth. Indeed, Robin judges shrewdly when he says that Nym and his two associate "swashers" are indeed "three such antics [buffoons]" that altogether they "do not amount to a man."[59] The word "antic," with its suggestion of an actor on a stage is par-

[51] G. Sarrazin, "Nym und Ben Jonson," *Sh. Jb.*, XL, 213-22. Cf. G. L. Kittredge, *Complete Works of Shakespeare*, Boston [copr. 1936] 64.
[52] Lemnie, *op. cit.*, leaf 23 v.
[53] *Ibid.*, leaf 81 r.
[54] *Ibid.*, leaf 80 r, The choleric type was lean and muscular, 129 r.
[55] Batman, *op. cit.*, leaf 32 r.
[56] Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. D 4 r
[57] *Ibid.*, sig. E 1 r and v.
[58] *Merry Wives*, I, ii, 127.
[59] *Henry V*, III, ii, 30.

ticularly happy in describing the "choleric" Nym, whose every word and deed—or lack of words and deeds—belies his vaunted "humor": it is a part that he has basely conned to make his silence glib, and his poltroonery seemingly turbulent.

Corporal Nym, within his narrow compass of less than eighty lines, is a rather complex figure in two contrasting planes: what he really was, and what he pretended, and perhaps wished to be. Indeed, he is a very Swiftean figure of a sham; and even his faults of vengefulness against Pistol and quarrelsome truculence are not authentic; and the disparity between his actual humor and that that he assumed must have been to the audience a humorous thing indeed. Such a figure, done in so little space, is a *tour de force* of dramatic mastery; and, when one remembers how few critics have penetrated the shams even of the full-length portraiture of Falstaff, one wonders that an Elizabethan audience could actually see throught the *aes triplex* of Corporal Nym's disguise, and tell the actuality from the coat of brass. In fact, however, as in the case of Falstaff, the explanation is not far to seek: pickpockets and other sharpers, such as Nym, who paraded under the guise of "good soldiers and tall fellows," were common in Elizabethan London; and, as soon as such a one by the merest hint betrayed himself on the stage, the audience would agnize the type, would look for the accustomed shams, and laugh accordingly. Thus the realism of Shakspere's characters was an essential adjunct to the clarity of his art; but we, who do not always recognize these types, are oftentimes confused; for it is an irony of historic scholarship that what is most commonplace in one age imposes in another the greatest difficulty to ascertain and prove: the commonplace is rarely written down. Thus if an Elizabethan could read the present essay on Corporal Nym and his oddly assorted professions and his oddly assorted "humors," that Elizabethan would doubtless laugh, not only at the admirable Corporal, but also at the notion that anyone needed to elucidate such an obvious human platitude as he. This is an added, un-Shaksperian humor of Corporal Nym; and, for such an undertaking as the present, an Elizabethan, in the Corporal's *ipsa verba,* would probably suggest the short, acidulous motto, "pauca, pauca; slice!"

West Virginia University.

W. S. GILBERT AND SHAKSPERE

By E. P. VANDIVER, JR.

The purposes of this paper are, first, to show that England's greatest librettist regarded Shakspere with proper respect and, secondly, to indicate his use of Shaksperian material in his plays and operas.

I.

ONE of the most recent biographies of Gilbert and Sullivan leaves one with the impression that Gilbert heartily disliked Shakspere,[1] that he considered him obscure in utterance,[2] and that he never lost an opportunity to say something derogatory about Shakspere.[3] In opposition, however, to this view of Gilbert's lack of veneration for Shakspere, we have Gilbert's own words in a paper entitled "Unappreciated Shakespeare," published in 1890 (when Gilbert was at the height of his career), in *Foggerty's Fairy,* a collection of stories and sketches.[4] His remarks are very interesting, and inasmuch as this essay is apparently not well known and is not readily obtainable, a brief anaylsis and summary of it seem desirable.[5]

Gilbert begins with the statement that he is about to express an "audacious" theory: namely, "that the people of England have no real appreciation of the merits of their most distinguished poet." Then he anticipates the arguments that will be raised against his contention: that Shakspere is held in high veneration by Englishmen as a poet, thinker and dramatist, that his plays are well attended and enthusiastically greeted, that any public speaker has only to quote a few lines from Shakspere to receive great applause. In reply to these imagined statements Gilbert writes: "My argument is, not that Shakespeare does not deserve all that is said and done in his honour, but that he deserves so much more."

---

[1]Hesketh Pearson, *Gilbert and Sullivan* (Harpers, New York and London, 1935), p. 273.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]*Ibid.,* p. 274.

[4]According to Sidney Dark and Rowland Grey (*W. S. Gilbert: His Life and Letters* (Methuen, London, 1924), pp. 36-39), this essay had previously appeared in 1869.

[5]"Unappreciated Shakspeare," in *Foggerty's Fairy and Other Tales* (George Routledge and Sons, London, 1890), pp. 331-336.

"He deserves to be read, but who reads him?" Although admitting that a few people have studied Shakspere thoroughly, Gilbert contends that most people have only a superficial knowledge of his works, asking how many Englishmen are there who can truthfully say that they have read such plays as *All's Well that Ends Well, Richard II, Coriolanus, Cymbeline,* and *Troilus and Cressida.*

Since most people consider it a disgrace not to know Shakspere's plays, continues Gilbert, "works with which it is considered—and most rightly—that all Englishmen should be familiar," they rush to the theaters to see them rather than read them. Unfortunately, however, the theatergoers usually do not see the plays performed as Shakspere intended them to be, but cut and mutilated versions: for example, about half of *Hamlet,* three acts of *Henry VIII,* three acts of *The Taming of the Shrew,* and four acts of *The Merchant of Venice.* "Who resents these atrocious liberties? I do and the reader does, but who else?"

In conclusion, Gilbert states that he will point the moral of his essay with a quotation from John Heminge and Henrie Condell, prefixed to the First Folio edition of Shakspere, of which the last sentence quoted is: "Read him, therefore, and againe, and againe, and if then you do not like him, surely you are in some manifest danger, not to understand him."

To sum up, Gilbert not only admits Shakspere's greatness but also chides Englishmen for not reading and studying him more than they do and for not demanding that his plays be presented without alterations.

II.

There are many things in Gilbert's writings which remind one of Shakspere.[6] In his early work and in his later work one finds ideas and phrases which would not have assumed the form they did had it not been for Shakspere. For instance, Gilbert seems to have taken the same delight in word play that the youthful, exuberant Shakspere did.

[6]For example, Mr. Isaac Goldman has previously pointed out that Gonzalo's speech on the ideal commonwealth (in *The Tempest*) may have influenced Gilbert in the Utopian ideas expressed in *The Gondoliers.* ("W. S. Gilbert's Topsy-Turvydom," in *The Bookman* (April, 1928, LXVII, 149).

In his first attempt at drama, *Dulcamara* (1866), is an echo from Macbeth's famous soliloquy. In the *dramatis personae* is

> Tomaso (a Notary, keeping company with Gianetta; "Tomaso and Tomaso, and Tomaso, creeps with his pretty *paysanne.*"—Shakspere).

Whether or not this seems funny depends on the individual's sense of humor; but, at any rate, it seems not unlike some of Shakspere's early punning.

It is quite easy to imagine that a man with the comic sense of Gilbert would react against extravagant and uncritical praise of Shakspere, and that he would aim his shaft at some of the pedantic quibbles of Shaksperian scholarship and at actors whose interpretation of Shakspere he did not care for. An examination of Gilbert's work, moreover, seems to bear out this assumption. Most of his Shaksperian references are concerned with *Hamlet,* and his satire is directed rather against what critics and actors have done to Shakspere's plays than against Shakspere himself. At times, however, Gilbert cannot resist the temptation to use a well-known line of a tragic speech in a comic situation. In *Princess Ida* (1884), for instance, are brief parodies of passages in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth:*

> *Hilarion.* I think I see her now.
> *Hildebrand.* Ha! let me look!
> *Hilarion.* In my mind's eye, I mean . . .[7]

And Melissa tells the young men who are disguised as young ladies:

> My mother guessed your sex! It was my fault—
> I blushed and stammered so that she exclaimed,
> "Can these be men?" Then, seeing this, 'Why these—"
> *"Are men,"* she would have added, but *"are men"*
> Stuck in her throat![8]

In the *dramatis personae* of *Ruddigore* (1887) is "Old Adam Goodheart (Robin's Faithful Servant)"; this reference reminds one of Adam, Orlando's old faithful servant in *As You Like It.*

Gilbert's only dramatic work based entirely on a Shak-

[7] W. S. Gilbert, *Original Plays* (third series, Chatto and Windus, London, 1928), p. 136. All later references to Gilbert's plays and operas will be to the third series of this edition.

[8] P. 157.

sperian play, however, did not come from his pen until a short play, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern,* appeared in 1891. Here again the rays of the Comic Spirit are turned rather upon Shaksperian actors and critics than the author himself, although the irrepressible Gilbert does reveal a humorous aspect of certain serious scenes, but in such a way that Shakspere himself would probably have enjoyed them as well as the argument of the play:

> King Claudius, when a young man, wrote a five-act tragedy which was damned, and all reference to it forbidden under penalty of death. The King has a son—Hamlet—whose tendency to soliloquize has so alarmed his mother, Queen Gertrude, that she has sent for Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, to devise some Court revels for his entertainment. Rosencrantz is a former lover of Ophelia (to whom Hamlet is betrothed), and they lay their heads together to devise a plan by which Hamlet may be put out of the way. Some Court theatricals are in preparation. Ophelia and Rosencrantz persuade Hamlet to play his father's tragedy before the King and Court. Hamlet, who is unaware of the proscription, does so, and is banished, and Rosencrantz happily united to Ophelia.

A thrust at the non-Danish appearance of the Hamlets on the stage—stature, hair, accent, pronunciation, nationality—is put into the mouth of Ophelia. Being asked by Guildernstern what Hamlet is like, she replies:

> Alike for no two seasons at a time.
> Sometimes he's tall—sometimes he's very short—
> Now with black hair—now with a flaxen wig—
> Sometimes an English accent—then a French—
> Then English with a strong provincial "burr".
> Once an American, and once a Jew—
> But Danish never, take him how you will![10]

Then the shaft is directed against the scholars who have consumed too much time debating whether Hamlet was sane or mad:

> *G.* Oh, he is surely mad!
> *O.* Well, there again
> Opinion is divided. Some men hold
> That he's the sanest, far, of all sane men—
> Some that he's really sane, but shamming mad—
> Some that he's really mad, but shamming sane—
> Some that he will be mad, some that he *was*—
> Some that he couldn't be. But on the whole
> (As far as I can make out what they mean)

[9]P. 76.
[10]P. 79.

> The favourite theory's somewhat like this:
> Hamlet is idiotically sane
> With lucid intervals of lunacy.[11]

In the second tableau Hamlet is interrupted in his famous soliloquy by Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, who attempt to answer his rhetorical questions; and he is thwarted in his "play-upon-me" episode when one of the young men is quite willing to play for him. This and other passages in the second and third tableaux furnish good fun. A novel way of regarding Hamlet's famous advice to the players is found in the players' reply to him, politely expressed, that he had better mind his own business and let the actors mind theirs. Later, near the close of the play, when it is decided to banish Hamlet to England, Gilbert laughs at those English people whose worship of Hamlet approaches fanaticism. Ophelia says:

> If but the half I've heard of them be true
> They will inshrine him in their great good hearts,
> And men will rise or sink in good esteem
> According as they worship him, or slight him![12]

In commenting on his play, Claudius borrows his phraseology from Philostrate's speech concerning the "rude mechanicals' " play in *A Midsummer Night's Dream:*

> The acts were five—though by five acts too long.

And he continues with two puns that certainly sound Elizbethan, if not Shaksperian:

> I wrote an Act by way of epilogue—
> An act by which the penalty of death
> Was meted out to all who sneered at it.
> They play was not good—but the punishment
> Of those that laughed at it was capital.[13]

About six months after the performance of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* appeared Gilbert's libretto *The Mountebanks* (January, 1892). The satire in connection with *Hamlet,* although a minor part of the story, is the only other important instance, besides the play just discussed, of Gilbert's working with Shaksperian material. He strikes again at the actors who desire to interpret *Hamlet* accord-

[11] P. 80.
[12] P. 89.
[13] P. 78.

ing to their pet whims. Pietro, proprietor of a troupe of mountebanks, converses with his clown, Bartolo:

P. Nonsense! Hamlet and Ophelia never married. It would be trifling with the text.

B. Anyhow, it's a new reading. What! am I to be the only Hamlet who is not permitted to discover new readings? Bah![14]

This is followed by a song, the first stanza of which, in Gilbert's delightful pattering style, humorously tells the story of Ophelia, while the second stanza contrasts her unfavorably with the modern maiden, who instead of dying of unrequited love, sues for breach of promise and secures heart balm of a pecuniary kind. The stanzas are sung by Pietro and Nita, a dancing girl:

P. Ophelia was a dainty little maid,
Who loved a very melancholy Dane;
Whose affection of the heart, so it is said,
Preceded his affection of the brain.
Heir-apparent to the Crown,
He thought lightly of her passion.
Having wandered up and down,
In an incoherent fashion;
When she found he wouldn't wed her,
In a river, in a meadder,
Took a header, and a deader
Was Ophelia!

N. Ophelia to her sex was a disgrace,
Whom nobody could feel compassion for.
Ophelia should have gone to Ely Place
To consult an eminent solicitor.
When such promises as these
Breaks a suitor, rich and regal,
Why, substantial damages
Is the panacea legal—
From a jury—sons of Adam,
Though as stony as Cacadam,
Maid or madam, she'd have had 'em,
Would Ophelia![15]

In the last stanza above, however, whom is Gilbert satirizing? The old-fashioned Ophelia, who dies of a broken heart, or the type of modern woman like Gilbert's Angelina (in *Trial by Jury*), who beseeches the jury, in her suit for breach of promise against Edwin, to give her justice:

[14] P. 400.
[15] *Ibid.*

Oh, see what a blessing, what love and caressing
I've lost, and remember it, pray,
When you whom I'm addressing, are busy assessing
The damages Edwin must pay?

This brings to an end the attempt to point out some of the most obvious examples of Gilbert's use of Shaksperian material in his own works. Though this study has not been an exhaustive one, the following conclusions seem to be true: though Gilbert did use Shaksperian material as a "source of innocent merriment" and also for satire, he seems to be engaged primarily in letting the Comic Spirit turn its light on the antics of temperamental actors, the profitless theorizing of pedants, and other activities and customs of people in the nineteenth century that might well be criticized. His high regard for Shakspere, which was discussed at the beginning of this paper, he has explicitly stated.

Mary Baldwin College
Staunton, Virginia

MACBETH AND *PARADISE LOST*

By GRANT MCCOLLEY

AMONG the varied problems of Miltonic criticism, few have proved more stubborn than the group connected with the revolt of Satan. Of particular interest is the origin of the Seraph Abdiel, one of Milton's five most important angels, and the fourth in the space allotted to him. More or less complete counterparts have been discovered for all other outstanding characters in the epic, but for Abdiel none.[1] He stands unique as the one important angel apparently wholly created by Milton. Again, although the Archangels Uriel, Michael, Raphael and Gabriel are active throughout much of *Paradise Lost,* Abdiel is first mentioned in Book V, 805, and he disappears after VI, 369. His rôle is confined to events which follow immediately the withdrawal of Satan to his quarters in the North, and in this rôle Milton's unique Seraph underwent experiences roughly analogous to those of Macduff in portions of the drama. The satan of Book V, 600 ff. may also be compared to Macbeth. Because of the poet's acquaintance with Shakspere's plays in general and with this tragedy in particular, it is of interest to review a number of *Macbeth-Paradise Lost* correspondences which have been largely neglected.[2] These correspondences, fundamentally in structure and character, are given for convenience of comparison in parallel columns.

Paradise Lost, V, 583 *ff.*	*Macbeth,* I, iv and 27 ff.
The empyreal host . . . by imperial summons called	*Forres. The Palace. Enter Dncan, Malcolm, Donalbain, Lennox, and attendants. Enter Macbeth, Banquo, Ross and Angus. Duncan.* "Noble Banquo . . .
. . . before the Almighty's throne . . . appeared	let me infold thee and hold thee to my heart . . .
Under their hierarchs . . . The Father infinite,	Sons, kinsmen, thanes, / And you whose places are the nearest, know
By whom in bliss imbosomed sat the Son . . .	We will establish our estate upon
Hear all ye Angels, Progeny of Light,	

[1]Editors of *Paradise Lost* are uniformly silent regarding the origins of Abdiel; our most distinguished authority in the angelology of the epic, Professor Harris Fletcher, has found no counterpart for the Seraph in extra-Biblical literature (*Milton's Rabbinical Readings,* Urbana, 130). He is, of course, not an angel of canonical Scripture.

[2]Among recent studies of the Milton-Shakspere relationship are those of Professors Hales, "Milton's Macbeth," *Nineteenth Century,* XXX, 919-32; Hanford, "The Dramatic Element in Milton," *SP,* XIV, 178-95; Thaler, "The Shaksperian Element in Milton," *PMLA,* XL, 645-91; and G. C. Taylor, "Shakespeare and Milton Again," *SP,* 189-99.

Thrones . . . Powers, / Hear my decree . . .
This day I have begot whom I declare
My only Son . . . / Your head I him
appoint . . .
appoint . . .
Under his . . . vicegerent reign abide
United as one individual soul,
For ever happy. Him who disobeys,
Me disobeys, breaks union . . .
All seemed well pleased; all seemed
but were not all . . .
He, of the first / If not the first
Archangel, great in power,
In favour, and preëminence . . .
fraught / With envy against the Son of
God . . .
Honoured by his great Father . . .
Through pride . . . thought himself impaired.
Deep malice thence conceiving . . .

New laws thou seest imposed;
New laws . . . new minds may raise . . .
new counsels to debate . . .
More in this place
To utter is not safe.

Tell them that . . . ere yet dim Night
withdraws . . .
I am to haste . . . /Homeward with flying
march . . .
there to prepare / Fit entertainment to
receive
our King . . . / Who speedily through
all the
Hierarchies / Intends to pass . . .
He together calls . . . the Regent
Powers . . .
Tells the suggested cause, and casts between
Ambiguous words and jealousies to sound
Or taint integrity . . .
Now ere Night, / Now ere dim Night
had
disincumbered Heaven . . . / The great
hierarchal standard was to move . . .

V, 866 ff.

Then thou shalt behold / Whether . . .
we intend . . .
Beseeching or besieging. This report,
These tidings, carry to the Anointed King;
And Fly, ere evil intercept thy flight . . .
O Spirit accursed . . .

And with retorted scorn his back he
turned / On these proud towers, to
swift destruction doomed.

Our eldest, Malcolm, whom we name
hereafter
The Prince of Cumberland . . .
Signs of nobleness . . . shall shine
On all deservers. From hence to Inverness,
And bind us further to you.
Macbeth. [*Aside*] Stars, hide your fires;
Let . . . / The eye wink at the hand . . .
Duncan. [*To Macbeth*] Welcome . . .
/ To make thee
full of growing . . . a peerless kinsman! . . .
Macbeth. The Prince of Cumberland!
That is a step / On which I must
fall down, or else o'erleap, / For
in my way it lies . . . Let not light
see my black and deep desires . . .

IV, iii, 4 ff.

Macduff. [*To Malcolm*] Each new morn
New widows howl, new orphans cry,
new sorrows / Strike heaven on the
face . . .
Malcolm. Let not my jealousies be your
dishonours, / But mine own safties.

I, iv, 45.

Macb. I'll be myself the harbinger . . .

I, v, 33-4, 67-9

Lady M. Thy master . . . / Would have
inform'd
for preparation . . . He that's coming /
Must be provided for . . .
Macb. This I made good to you . . . /
How
you were borne in hand, how cross'd . . .
you can let this go?

III, ii, 40 ff.

Ere the bat hath flown . . .ere . . . /
Hath rung night's yawning peal, there
shall be done / A deed of dreadful
note.

III, vi, 29 ff.

Lord. Macduff is gone to pray the
holy King . . .
and this report / Hath so exasperate
the King that he / Prepares for . . .
war.
Lennox. Some holy angel / Fly to . . .
England
and unfold / His message ere he come . . .
Under a hand accurs'd! . . .
Lord. And with an absolute 'Sir, not I,'
The cloudy messenger turns me his back,
and hums . . . 'You'll rue the time' . . .

VI, 17 ff.
Flaming arms . . . met his view . . . he . . . found / Already known what he for news had thought / To have reported . . .
The easier conquest now / Remains thee [Abdiel] . . . on thy foes more glorious to return . . .

VI, 152 ff.
Receive . . . the first essay . . . of this [Abdiel's] right hand . . .
This greeting on thy impious crest receive . . .a noble stroke . . . with tempest fell
On the proud crest of Satan . . .

VI, 254 ff.
He opposed . . . his ample shield . . .
to Hell . . . / Ere this avenging sword . . .
Nor think thou with wind . . . to awe . . .

IV, iii, 133 ff.
Malcolm . . . before thy here—approach Old Siward, with ten thousand warlike men, Already was setting forth.
Ross. Now is the time of help; your [Macduff's] eye in Scotland / Would create soldiers . . .

V, vii, 18 ff.
Macd. Either thou, Macbeth, / Or else my sword . . . I sheathe again undeeded.

V, viii, 11 ff.
Mach. Let fall thy blade on vulnerable crests . . . / Before my body
I throw my warlike shield.

V, viii, 3 ff.
Macd. Turn, hell-hound . . . I have no words:
My voice is my sword . . .

The preceding correspondences have suggested a number of similarities between Satan and the character Macbeth. Both were present at an assemblage where the King personally announced investiture of his son. Satan implicitly and Macbeth explicitly concealed displeasure provoked by the announcement. Exclusive of the King, they had been first in power, and were first in his favor. The investiture of the son was regarded as adversely affecting their interests, and led one to conceive "deep malice;" the other to speak of "black and deep desires." They hastened home as harbingers to prepare for a royal progress, although no progress takes place in *Paradise Lost.* The blow of Abdiel "fell on the proud crest of Satan," and Macbeth advised Macduff to "Let fall thy blade on vulnerable crests."[3] Somewhat later the Satan-Michael and Macbeth-Macduff encounters were prefaced by contrasts between words and deeds. In a further passage Satan's chief accomplice "casts . . . ambiguous words and jealousies, to sound or taint integrity." This is precisely what Macbeth does at his second meeting with the murderers of Banquo.[4]

[3]Milton's familiarity with this scene is definitely indicated by his lines, XI, 496-7, "Though not of woman born: compassion quelled / His best of man."

[4]In V, 673-5, Satan addressed his fellow conspirator as "companion dear," and in language befitting family intimacy, asked, "What sleep can close thy eyelids?" Macbeth's fellow in crime is addressed as his "dearest love." Again, Satan complained because the sleep of his companion *dissented,* and held apart the two who "waking . . . were one." In the drama it is personified sleep which prevented Macbeth from completing all details of his crime, and led him to reject his lady's emphatic request that he do so. That Milton knew Shakspere's "Glamis hath murdered sleep" . . . is further suggested by the well-known passage in IV, 877 ff. The precise meaning of the poet's "not so waked Satan" is far from clear, but by implication Satan had slept, and upon awakening had experienced a change in attitude. Quite curiously, the personified hope of Macbeth had "slept . . . and wakes . . . now" with a changed point of view. It is important that in the epic, Satan did not change his attitude; he had been and remained displeased.

The Seraph Abdiel was at the outset one of Satan's host, but refused to rebel against Deity, and unleashed a fiery verbal attack upon his immediate leader. He was commanded by Satan to carry "this report" to the "Anointed King," and to "fly, ere evil" intercepted his flight. In answer, Abdiel castigated Satan as a spirit "accursed, . . . and with retorted scorn his back he turned," the one instance in *Paradise Lost* where a character is described as turning his back. The faithful Seraph then hastened to the Throne to inform God of Satan's rebellion, and to warn him to prepare for conflict, but found his message anticipated and preparation for war complete. He was specifically requested by God to return and attack his "foes." His first encounter was with Satan, and his sword "fell on the proud crest" of his former superior. In Shakspere's drama Macduff became the principal opponent of Macbeth, defied the commands brought by his representative, and with the retort, "Sir, not I . . . turns me his back." He went to "pray the holy King" that he prepare an army and attack Macbeth. In this passage Lennox expressed the hope that some angelic messenger would fly to England, and anticipate Macduff's mission ere he arrived. Macduff was then censured as "a hand accursed." When Macduff reached England he found his mission anticipated, and preparation for attacking Macbeth complete. He immediately was asked to return and do battle against his enemy. The first encounter of Macduff, and one described as such, was with Macbeth, who admonished him to "Let fall thy blade on vulnerable crests."[5]

Both Deity and King Duncan emphasized the desirability of unity immediately following announcement of the anointment of their sons. Milton's statement that the "great hierarchal standard was to move"—an action important in the rebellion, is preceded by repetition of *ere* in a description of the time of night. Shakspere's "deed of dreadful note" is preceded by a similar repetition of *ere* in a description of the hour of the evening. In only one sentence of *Paradise Lost* does Milton repeat the word *new* more than twice, and here he employs it four times. Satan directed this remark against Deity and the Son, and followed it with the declaration that "more in this place to utter is not safe."

[5]Milton employs the word "crest" only in descriptions of the head or helm of Satan, twice where he is disguised as the serpent, and three times where he is the warrior.

In describing the tyrannous actions of his king, Macduff four times repeated the word "new" in a single sentence. Some twenty lines later, the cautious Malcolm declared that "mine own safeties" occasioned his reticence.[6] There can be no question as to Milton's acquaintance with and interest in this scene, for as the final jottings of proposed works in the Trinity College manuscript inform us, he once planned to write a tragedy of "Macbeth. Beginning at the arrivall of Malcom at Mackduffe."

[6] *Cf.* *Paradise Lost,* III, 639 ff.

(Satan) Suitable grace diffused; so well he feigned. / Under a coronet his . . . hair . . . neither man nor angel can discern / Hypocrisy . . . Uriel . . . to the . . . imposer foul . . .

Macbeth, IV, iii, 2-4

Which you are my thoughts cannot transpose; Angels are bright still, though the brightest fell; Though all things foul would wear the brows of grace, / Yet grace must still look so.

Mutatis mutandis, it is apparent that the Abdiel of *Paradise Lost* shares with the Macduff of Shakspere's drama a number of comparable experiences. Similarly, Satan and Macbeth have much in common. These and the several structural correspondences under discussion deserve, it would seem, some recognition in commentaries upon the epic. If milton were consciously or unconsciously indebted to *Macbeth,* we possess a partial explanation of the origin of the unique Abdiel and light on a variety of incidental details. It is understood that there are other explanations of the similarities reviewed, but the possibility of indebtedness in *Paradise Lost* to the tragedy which most interested Milton seems not unworthy of careful thought.

Smith College,
Northampton, Mass.

THE NEW CAMBRIDGE SHAKSPERE AND *THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA*

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

HOW EVER one looks at it, whether from the textual, critical, grammatical, rhetorical, theatrical or linguistic viewpoint, the "new" Cambridge edition of Shakspere's works, published by the Cambridge University Press and edited by Professor J. D. Wilson (with the collaboration of Sir Arthur Quiller-Coutch—"Q"—in the early volumes), must be regarded not only as an unscholarly but also as a dangerous piece of work—dangerous because it violates the fundamental principles of scientific criticism, indulges too freely and unrestrainedly in fantastic guesses and conjectures, ignores available evidence even on important matters, oversteps the bounds of legitimate editorial commentary, and obviously aims to startle rather than to investigate or instruct. In confirmation of this condemnation we shall make a critical study of these editors' text and commentary in one of the most easily edited plays in the Shakspere canon: *The Two Gentlemen of Verona.*

The Two Gentlemen is not one of the world's great plays. In fact, it might safely be relegated to an obscure place among the worst. Its story is preposterous, its dramatic technique puerile, its characters inconsistent and puppet-like, its dialogue dull, uninteresting, and unnatural, its jesting insipid, long drawn out and superfluous, its ehics pernicious, its philosophy juvenile, and its most humorous touches vulgar. The only reasons for studying it are its place in the development of English romantic comedy and in Shakspere's artistic career.

Even the introduction, easygoing, prolix, and utterly inadequate for the general reader for whom this edition is (said to be) intended, is not free from downright errors and perverse opinions. Enough, however, of generalities; let us proceed to particulars.

On page viii Jonson's play is called *'Batholomew's Fair'* instead of *'Bartholomew Fair'*; on page ix the baptismal name of the author of *Romeus and Juliet* is given as "George" instead of "Arthur." On page vii the writer of the preface, "Q," informs his readers—without even as

much as "I guess" that "the theatrical people had played some strange tricks" upon the play, although there is not a particle of evidence extant to justify this censure of "the theatrical people."

On page x we are told that *The Two Gentlemen* is a "graceful story charmingly told," although it is only a clumsy and unnecessarily padded tale of a preposterously incredible kind told so poorly that "Q" himself blames the poet's associates for having played "strange tricks" upon it—tricks which make it unactable as it stands,—having cut out necessary scenes, added needless characters, (*e.g.,* Speed), dropped out some of the original characters (*e.g.,* Julia's father), bungled the geography of the play (confusing Milan, Verona, and Mantua), confused the Duke's social station, ruined the time sequence, and so transmogrified the last scene that Dr. Wilson ("Q's" associate) characterizes it as being "infamous."

To "Q" Valentine is (page xii) a "gentleman to the core"—an opinion with which no reader who knows the renaissance ideal of what constitutes a gentleman can agree. Valentine persistently insults his rival Thurio in the presence of the lady they are wooing (II, iv, 13-45); he lies to the Emperor-Duke about the merits of Thurio and his desirability as a husband for Silvia (III, i, 63-66); he betrays the confidence of his host by plotting to steal away his daughter, writes his lady-love a smutty sonnet on the eve of their nocturnal escapade, becomes the leader of a band of highwaymen, makes no attempt to rejoin his family, and finally offers up his sweetheart to the man who had just attempted to rape her. A gentleman to the core!

On page xvi the writer of "the final scene" of the play—at least, of parts of it—is called a "faker" who "not only was not Shakespeare, but did not possess even a rudimentary ear for blank verse." "The opening lines (V, iii, 1ff) bewray [!] him," says "Q," but he has evidently overlooked the fact that the opening speech he quotes ("come, come, be patient; we must bring you to our captain") is prose, and that in accordance with Elizabethan usage, such minor characters as Outlaws speak prose and verse indiscriminately. As for the rest of the lines quoted—which, by the way, are not in the "final scene": they are no worse metrically than hundreds of such lines in Shakspere, and are better than many we could quote from this and other plays.

On page ix "Q" says, without any reservations, that the "Proteus and Julia story comes straight [!] out of an episodic tale in a Spanish romance, *Diana Enamorada* . . . translated by Bartholomew Yonge." But this translation was first published in 1598, and writers say that *The Two Gentlemen* was written prior to 1594 or 1595, perhaps even as early as 1590. An inquisitive student might wish to know whether "Q" was of the opinion that Shakspere had had access to Young's manuscript translation prior to its publication, or whether Shakspere "borrowed" characters and situations, possibly also ideas, from a now lost play based on Montemayor's rambling amorous tales. But as to these problems "Q" sayeth nought, and "W" is not a whit more communicative.

A suggestive instance of "Q's" failure to understand Shakspere occurs on page xii. He there comments on what he calls Silvia's "hesitancy" in handing back Valentine's letter (II, i, 117-122) and compares the incident to Beatrice's "feminine hesitancy" in declaring her love to Benedick. But the two scenes are in no way comparable. Silvia is having her little joke with the stupid Valentine and has no reason in the world for hesitating. The frequency with which she urges him to take his letter is sufficient indication of a total absence of hesitancy. Beatrice's situation, involving a declaration of love for a man whom she had always pretended to hold in contempt, is wholly different.

Speaking of Sir Eglamour, whom he describes (page xvii) as "an honest, simple gentleman" who should "not be confused with the knight of that name who figures among Julia's suitors in Act I, Scene 2, "Q" says, with reference to his behavior in the forest scene (V, iii), "Without warning or excuse he is reported to have taken to his heels like the veriest poltroon!" But this badly worded sentence does Sir Eglamour a great injustice; Shakspere does not say that he ran away "without warning or excuse" or that he fled "like the veriest poltroon." We may rest assured that Shakspere made Eglamour "nimble-footed" for a purpose; he ran to summon assistance. Living in an age of chivalry which approved of Robin Hood, he knew that Sylvia would be unharmed by her captors, men endowed with "worthy qualities," "reformed, civil, full of good." Have they not pledged themselves (in IV, i) to their chivalrous captain

to "do no outrages on silly women or poor passengers"? Such "vile base practices" these honorable thieves "detest." Eglamour, being "valiant" as well as "wise," acted like a gentleman in taking to his heels when staying would have done no good.

One of the most amazing things about "Q's" introduction is his failure to appreciate Shakspere's dramatic skill in removing Eglamour from the play at this point. The story requires Proteus to attack Silvia; how could he do this if her escort were by? Shakspere, we know, does almost anything to wind up a play. No fake adaptor would have been clever enough for this. Eglamour ran away on dramatic necessity, if for no other reason.

So determined are "Q" and W to put the onus of Valentine's magnanimous transfer of his interest in Silvia to the repentant Proteus upon one or more hypothetical "adaptors," that they conjure up difficulties where there are none. Proteus, we may recall, says

> "were man
> But Constant, he were perfect; that one error
> Fils him with faults: makes him run through all th' sins;
> Inconstancy falls-off, ere it begins
> What is in *Silvia's* face, but I may spie
> More fresh in *Julia's,* with a constant eye?"
>
> (V, iv, 111-116).

"Can anyone," Queries "Q" (page xviii), "believe Shakespeare guilty of this pair of [rhyming] tags: the first lame in scansion and unmeaning, the second balanced for our choice between nonsense and rascality?" W backs up "Q" (pages 103-04) by telling us that "all th' sins" is "not Shakespearian. Shakespeare never contracts the definite article before a consonant, except when it is preceded by a preposition, *e.g.,* 'by th', 'i'th,' 'o'th,' etc."

Most editors, including Sampson, Rolfe, Hudson, Porter and Clarke, Nichols, pass the passage over without comment, because (presumably) they find nothing in it that is noteworthy, obscure or nonsensical. The meaning obviously is: "The inconstant person (the philanderer) falls off (becomes disloyal) even ere he begins to love. After all," continues Proteus, "Silvia's face has no feature which is not bettered in Julia's, if I regard her (Julia) with the eye of a constant lover." As for rascality—we see none. On the contrary, we have here one of those instances of a general-

ization from a character's own experience which stamps the passage as peculiarly Shaksperian.

The scansion of line 113 is not so bad as W and "Q" would make it. In fact, it is a perfectly good iambic pentameter. W's assertion about what Shakspere never does need not worry us. Shakspere is rich in *hapax legomena.* A poet who at the age of forty (or thereabout) wrote "no teeth for th' present and "or th' Hircan tiger" (both in *Macbeth*) could have written "all th' sins" when he was twenty-six. Before we impugn Shakspere's authorship of these lines, we must also consider that the abbreviated definite article may be an unwarranted or accidental insertion by the compositor or by a copyist. "All sins" is just as good as "all the sins."

We now leave "Q's" introduction, remarking only that he has presented no cogent reason for thinking that this early play of Shakspere's had been revised by a theatrical botcher, and we turn our attention to W's atrocious text and worse commentary.

II

Notwithstanding his professed "consciousness of grave responsibility" in auspicating a new text of Shakspere's plays with all the aids of modern "scientific bibliography," W here presents us with a poorer text than any of his predecessors has given us. On the very first page we are confronted with a reading which deserves to be characterized as barbaric. Proteus is made to say (I, i, 24) that Leander was "over-shoes" in love, and Valentine says (line 25) that Proteus is "over-boots" in love. The justification for this is the fact that the Folio has the hyphens. But W does not intend to give us a facsimile of the Folio text, and he does not retain the hyphens generally or on any apparent principle. In this very scene the Folio prints "beades-man" (line 18), "lost-mutton" (lines 94 and 96), "laced-mutton" (line 95), "over-charg'd" (line 99), "over-take" (line 122), but W's text reads "beadsman," "lost mutton," "laced mutton," "overcharged" and "overtake." The contrast between Leander and Proteus consists in the former's being only "over *shoes*" in love and the latter, more deeply engaged, being "over *boots*" in love.

This contrast is easily brought home to a reader by printing the phrases in question without hyphens, whereas print-

ing them with hyphens raises in the ordinary reader's mind images of overshoes and overboots—goloshes, in other words—and utterly obscures the poet's meaning by its absurdity. It is a fact that Elizabethans used the phrases "over shoes and "over boots" metaphorically, most frequently as "over the shoes" and "over the boots," but this usage did not require the hyphen between the preposition and the noun. That the hyphens in the Folio are not of Shakspere's doing but the work of a presumptuous, ignorant and meddling scribe or compositor may be inferred from his absurd hyphenations elsewhere in this play, as in I, ii, 58 ("way-ward"), I, ii, 111 ("bruising-stones"), I, ii, 120 ("whirl-wind"), I, iii, 31 ("noble-men"), I, iii, 57 ("well-belov'd"), II, iv, 87 ("Be-like"), II, v, 28 (in Launce's "stand-under" and "under-stand" witticism), II, i, 105 ("hardly-off"), II, i, 19 ("mal-content"), II, i, 140 ("spokes-man"), II, iv, 78 ("un-welcome"), II, v, 6 ("Come-on, you mad-cap"), III, i, 40 ("corded-ladder"), III, i, 144 ("rest-them"), III, i, 223 ("un-revers'd"), III, i, 267 ("milk-maid"), III, ii, 94 ("on-set"), IV, iii, 20 ("true-love"), IV, iv, 191 ("fore-head"), V, ii, 52 ("reckless"), V, iii, 7 ("out-run"), V, iv, 114 ("falls-off"), instances among many others, in which W does not retain the hyphens. In the case of "over-shoes" and "over-boots" pseudo-scientific bibliography has "bewrayed" itself.

In I, i, 26, the Folio has "swom" (equivalent to the modern "swum") but W reads "swam."

In I, i, 75, the Folio text has the perfectly correct Elizabethan "And if" which W changes to the modern "An if."

In I, i, 97, Proteus speaks, correctly, of "such store of muttons," but W alters it, unnecessarily and without explanation, to "such a store of muttons."

In I, ii, 50, W reads "Will you be gone?" although F1 gives the pronoun as "ye," and veen though W seems to regard (without reason) the frequent occurrence of "ye" in this play an indication of the tamperings of an adaptor.

In I, ii, 68, W's text reads "Is it near dinner-time?" although the Folio reads "Is't near dinner time" [without a hyphen] and "near" can be read as a dissyllable.

In I, ii, 96, Julia says, in F1, "The mean is drown'd with you unruly bass" (which may be read "The mean is drown'd with [= by] you, unruly bass" (punning on

"base"), but W reads "The mean is drowned [*sic*] with your unruly bass."

In I, iii, 42, Panthino speaks of gentlemen who are journeying to salute the emperor and to "command" their services to his will; F correctly and sensibly reads "commend."

In I, iii, 88, Panthino says, in the generally accepted text, including W's, "Sir Proteus, your father calls for you—" and in a note he informs his readers that the Folio reads "Fathers," but he does not tell them that the Folio reads "call's" for "calls." Had he done so, we might have "guessed" that Shakspere intended Panthino to say "Sir Proteus, your father's call's for you," which makes perfectly good sense and does less violence to the original text than the generally received reading, as scientific bibliography would have realized. A stage-direction (*Father calls*) can be easily supplied by an editor as liberal with stage-directions as W is.

In I, iii, 90-91, Proteus says,

> "my heart accords thereto,
> And yet a thousand times it answers 'no.' "

The Folio text has "answer's"; if this is correct, as it may well be, "it" means "its" (as elsewhere in Shakspere). A modern editor has no right to falsify his author's text.

In II, i, 157, W reads "you have writ" where the Folio reads, correctly, "have you writ."

In II, iv, 52, W again substitutes "you" for "ye" of the Folio.

In II, iv, 70, W substitutes "Come" for the Folio's "Comes," although a singular verb often precedes a plural subject in Shakspere.

In II, iv, 77 (and in many other passages) W substitutes the adverb "awhile" for what we must regard as Shakspere's prepositional phrase "a while." Had W consulted the *Oxford Dictionary,* he would have learned that this is considered improper. See also III, i, 1, 59, V, iv, 27; etc.

In II, vi, 8, we have one of the most inexcusabe readings to be found in any modern text. Proteus, addressing Love (which W gives as "love"), begs her to teach him to "excuse" his treachery, but according to W he wants to be taught how to "execute" it, though that gives us a line which is metrically impossible. We wonder how the recent "discoveries" justify such an unnecessary and

reprehensible emendation (?). W ought to apply his bibliographic legerdemain to his own work.

In II, vi, 24, Proteus tries to convince himself that "Love is still most precious in it selfe." Silently and inexcusably W substitutes "more" for "most."

In II, vii, 32, W's newly auspicated text reads "wide ocean" instead of "wild ocean," "wild" meaning, of course, "turbulent." W thus adopts one of Collier's wildest emendations, because, he says (page 93), "No epithet could be more inappropriate than *wild*"—an opinion with which no modern scholar who knows his Shakspere will agree. It is not unlike Shakspere's mind to move in the course of seven lines to an image which leaves out of consideration the image it left behind. A conscientious editor, having a due sense of his responsibility, does not presume to "improve" on his author by the standards of his own unimaginative mind. Had W consulted Mr. Deighton's excellent edition of this play he would have found a paraphrase of the passage which would have saved him from a bad piece of botchery. Hudson, Nichols, Bond, and other modern editors have not even though it necessary to comment on the Folio text. That Shakspere meant to say "wild" is borne out by line 819 of his *Venus and Adonis:* "the wild waves will have him seen no more."

In III, i, 254, W introduces a hyphen between two words with disastrous effect. The hypocritical Proteus urges the wretched Valentine to depart at once, offering to confer with him at large of all that may concern his "love-affairs." W seems not to know that "love-affairs" (philanderings) and "love affairs" (matters pertaining to his love) are quite different. The hyphen, we may add, is not in the Folio; it's another one of W's or an ignorant compositor's improvements.

In III, i, 344, W reads "that I cannot help," though the Folio reads "that cannot I help."

In III, i, 172-73, the Folio text reads

> "banish'd from her,
> Is self from self: A deadly banishment:"

W wholly unnecessarily alters this to

> "banished [*sic*] from her,
> Is self from self . . . Ah! deadly banishment:"

This, I submit, is not editing, but editorial meddlesomeness prompted by a desire to appear smart, not to emend what is unintelligible or obviously corrupt.

In IV, i, 10, a prose line, W alters "he is" to "he's" for no better reason than that Capell did so and was followed by some modern editors (even by so fine a scholar as Mr. Bond!). W forgets that he promised his readers "a complete recension of Shakespeare's text" in the light of recent "discoveries" (as he miscalls certain speculations).

In IV, i, 51, W modernizes the grammatical construction by substituting "Whom" for "Who," though he considers the Folio text to be "Shakespearian."

In IV, 2, 88, without a word of comment, W abandons the Folio's "What's" for Pope's "What is," for metrical reasons, undoubtedly; but, if so, why does he not read "You'd" for "You Would" in line 85? In line 88 a gesture of impatience by Silvia may equate the lost syllable before "What's."

In IV, ii, 128, in deference to the Folio's "ore-night" W reads "o'ernight," even though the hyphens in this play occur so lawlessly that they can't possibly have had Shakspere's authority, and even though "o'ernight" may be interpreted by a modern reader as meaning either "before the night" (*N. E. D.*), "the previous night" or the "night before bed-time" (Schmidt) and even though "o'er night" expresses exactly the meaning intended. Nothing is gained and much is lost by reading "o'ernight."

In IV, iii, 31, W "corrects" Shakspere's grammar by printing "reward" instead of "rewards," even though other editors have no objections to following F.

In IV, iv, 40, W follows Malone in converting F's "ile" into "I will," notwithstanding the recent "discoveries" and the conservative practice of other editors.

In IV, iv, 49, W, again, for no reason, transposes "did she" into "she did."

IV, iv, 134.—"Though his false finger have prophan'd the Ring," says F, corectly, but W substitutes "hath" for "have."

In IV, iv, 160, W, without comment or apology, forsakes F's "iudgements" for Capell's "judgement."

In V, ii, 23, W has Proteus tell Thurio that, genealogically speaking, he is "well derived," thus following F, though "well-derived" would be better (and so it appears in W's glossary). On the other hand, in line 46 of this scene he deserts F's "Mountaine foote" for "mountain-foot." Caprice alone seems to determine W's text.

In V, ii, 47, W has two unjustifiable departures from the original text. He reads "towards" and "whither" for F's "toward" and "whether."

In V, iii, 7, F reads "Moyses" (not, as W gives it, "Moyfes"), but W changes this to "Moses," although "Moyses" was a common sixteenth-century spelling. In his charges against Marlowe (May 20, 1593), Richard Baines has "Moyses" three times, "Moses" not at all. Such an unnecessary departure from F, our sole authority, is a flagrant violation of editorial ethics and the requirements of scholarship.

In V, iv, 17 ("To keep them from uncivil outrages"), W ruins the sense as well as the metre by reading "uncivil from outrages." Of course, an ignorant compositor is to blame. "By Chrish, la! tish ill done."

III

The punctuation of W's text can be best described as illogical, inconsistent, chaotic, and confusing. Very frequently the obvious meaning is distorted by faulty punctuation. In illustration of this wholesale condemnation of the book before us we shall quote a few passages from it.

> "But, since thou lov'st; love still and thrive therein,
> Even as I would when I to love begin." (I, i, 9-10).

In defence of this barbarism W cannot say that he is following F, inasmuch as F also has commas after "still" and after would."

In I, i, 19, W changes F's correct question mark to an exclamation.

In I, i, 34, W's text reads, "How ever . . . but a folly bought with wit," because F has a colon after "ever." In his note to the reader W says that he represents original colons by three dots "when they appear to possess special dramatic significance." We doubt that anyone, even W, can find "special dramatic significance" in this colon.

In I, i, 33, W reads: "If lost, why then a grievous labor won;" even though commas before and after "then" would make it clear that Valentine uses the word as a conjunction (meaning "in that case"), not as an adverb of time. This improper pointing with reference to the word "then" occurs throughout W's book. In these cases W cannot even plead that he is following F, for in many instances he sticks

in a comma where F has none, *e.g.,* "Then, tell me, whither were I best to send him?" (I, iii, 24).

In I, i, 53, we are treated to "Once more adieu," although a comma after "more" is unquestionably needed.

Lines I, i, 57-59, are printed as follows:

> To Milan let me hear from thee by letters.
> Of thy success in love; and what news else
> Betideth here in absence of thy friend:"

F has no punctuation mark after "letters" and none is needed. The semicolon after "love" is absurd. With W's punctuation the second and third lines lack a verb.

I, i, 69, reads, absurdly, "Made wit with musing, weak; heart sick with thought."

I, i, 86. "Therefore I am no sheep." A comma after "therefore" is absolutely necessary. This applies also to I, i, 90: "Therefore thou art a sheep."

W promises to retain all original colons in his text but he frequently (and silently) breaks his promise. Thus, in I, i, 92, he reads "But dost thou hear?", although F has a colon instead of a question mark.

In I, i, 100, 129, we have "Nay sir," and "Truly sir," without the necessary comma before "Sir." Common sense dictates that such vocatives as "sir," "madam," etc., should be preceded and followed by commas. They are conspicuously and annoyingly absent in many passages in this book. In line 111 of this very scene we have "you mistook, sir." The inconsistency is exasperating.

In I, i, 138, W reads "What, said she—nothing?" although F reads "What said she, nothing?" W has no right to change the pronoun "What" into an exclamation. W's dash has no meaning.

I, ii, 2.—"Wouldst thou then counsel me to fall in love?" Commas are required before and after "then."

I, ii, 13.—"Well of his wealth; but of himself, so, so." Surely we should read "so so" or "so-so." The comma ruins the poet's meaning.

I, ii, 28.—"Yet he, of all the rest, I think best loves ye." Any logical editor would depart from the Folio and insert a comma after "think."

I, ii, 30.—"Fire, that's closest kept, burns most of all." The commas convey a wrong meaning.

I, ii, 71.—"Why didst thou stoop then?" A comma before "then" is indispensable.

I, ii, 72.—"To take a paper up, that I let fall." The comma does not belong here.

I, ii, 108.—"I'll kiss each several paper, for amends." W's punctuation would be appropriate if he intended to imply that the *dramatis personae* were suffering from asthma and had to stop to breathe. Julia especially seems to be thus afflicted. That is, perhaps, why she says "But twice, or thrice, was 'Proteus' written down." In the Folio the poor girl is much sicker than in W's text, if its punctuation may be trusted. There she says: "His litttle speaking, shows his love but small" (line 29), "They do not love, that do not show their love" (line 31, followed by W), "Say, say: who gave it thee?" (line 37, followed by W), "And pray her to a fault, for which I chid her" (line 53), "Since maids, in modesty, say no, to that Which they would have" etc. (lines 56-57, followed by W), "How churlishly, I chid Lucetta hence, When willingly, I would have her here?" (lines 61-62, silently abandoned by W, here as in hundreds of other passages, so as not to shake the readers' confidence in F's "good punctuation" based upon players' parts!). "Some love of yours, hath writ to you in rhyme" (line 78), "Till I have found each letter, in the letter" (line 119), "He couples it, to his complaining names" (line 127), etc., etc. Unfortunately this asthmatic punctuation cannot be used as a means of differentiating the persons in the play, for they are all intensely dyspnoeic. W may be right in employing a system of punctuation which indicates pauses of different lengths. In future volumes he may even indicate coughs (five dots) and sneezes (six dots).

In II, i, 3, W reads "Why then this [glove] may be yours," although a modern text demands commas after "Why" and after "then." With his customary inconsistency, W sometimes has commas after interjectional "why" even where F has none, as in II, i, 10 ("Why, sir, who bade you call her?").

In II, i, 12, Valentine replies to the impudent Speed with the words "Well: you'll still be too forward," though to the modern reader this conveys a meaning very different from what the speaker intended. Valentine does not mean to say "it is well;" his "well" is only an interjection. A comma should replace the colon.

In II, i, 12, Valentine replies to the impudent Speed more than to greet him, "As you enjoined me; I have writ

your letter," though there is not the slightest justification for the semicolon; a comma is what is required—unless we are to understand that Valentine is having a choking fit.

In II, i, 104, Valentine says to the approving Silvia, "Now trust me, madam, it came hardly off." Inasmuch as there is nothing to indicate that Silvia had ever mistrusted her timid lover, there is no sense in his pleading with her to trust him now. What sensitive reader does not know that there should be a comma after "Now"?

In II, ii, 6, Proteus says to Julia, who has just given him her ring, "Why then we'll make exchange," although in a similar sentence, in II, iv, 21, W prints "Well, then, I'll double your folly" (though F has no comma after "Well").

In II, iii, 12, Launce says, "why, my grandam having no eyes, look you, wept herself blind," although a comma after "grandam" is indispensable. The words "having no eyes, look you" are parenthetical.

In II, iii, 35, Panthino dismisses Launce with the words "Away ass, you'll lose the tide." A comma after "Away" is demanded by all rules of punctuation.

In II, iv, 91, W reads, "Nay, then he should be blind"—though F has no comma after "Nay" and logic requires a comma after "then."

In II, iv, 138, W ruins the passage by reading "Now, no discourse, except it be of love," although the "Now" is an adverb of time here, not an expletive.

W's punctuation often gives the reader a wholly false notion of the poet's meaning. In III, i, 351, Launce says, "More hair than wit: it may be I'll prove it." Of course, what he really means to say is that "it is possible that she has more hair than wit; I'll examine the proposition." He does not intend to say that "it is possible, I'll find it to be so" or that "it is possible that I'll investigate it." The punctuation required is this: "it may be; I'll prove it."

The sixth scene of Act II opens thus in W's text (the treacherous Proteus is the speaker):

> "To leave my Julia . . . shall I be forsworn?
> To love fair Silvia . . . shall I be forsworn?
> To wrong my friend, I shall be much forsworn . . ."

In defence of the absurd dots and interrogation points, W says (page 92): "Mod. edd [Modern editors] omit the query and read a comma after 'Julia' and 'Silvia.' The restoration of the F colons (represented by three dots)

makes the question marks explicable. Proteus is brooding." It needs no ghost from the grave to tell us that Proteus is brooding." Every reader of this play, especially W's text, knows that Proteus, the villain in an Elizabethan play, is indulging in a soliloquy in which he lays bare his mental processes and outlines the ensuing plot. That, however, has no bearing on the punctuation of these lines. Proteus cannot be asking himself whether he shall be forsworn if he forsake Julia; he is no fool. Nor can he be asking himself whether he will be forsworn if he love the fair Silvia. If he were indignantly rejecting the thought of doing anything that shall make him forsworn, he would not repeat the question. His assertion, in line 3, that by wronging Valentine he will be "much" forsworn shows that lines 1 and 2 are declarative assertions, paralleling what he says in line 3 and rising to a climax. This is further borne out by his reference to "threefold perjury" in line 5. Not a single editor before W has thought otherwise.

Why the Folio compositor put a question mark at the close of lines 1 and 2 is obvious: in both lines the pronoun "I" stands between the auxiliary "shall" and the predicate "be forsworne." He is guilty of the same silly practice when setting up sentnces beginning with "How" and "When," as in I, ii, 58-64 (a passage in which W silently substitutes exclamation marks for question marks).

An even more important point to be noted in connection with the lines we are discussing is this: W cannot be trusted to report faithfully the text of F. He speaks of the "F. colons" which he is "restoring" (by a succession of dots), but the Folio text here has no colons; both after "Julia" and after "Silvia" F has semicolons. Either W does not know a colon from a semicolon or his assertions cannot be accepted without verification.

The opening line of II, vii, reads, "Counsel, Lucetta, gentle girl assist me." The only ascertainable reason for W's omission of the necessary comma after "girl" is the fact that there is none in F. That W does not really respect F's punctuation we shall show by only one other quotation. The last two lines of II, vi, as given by W, stand thus:

> "Love, lend me wings to make my purpose swift,
> As thou hast lent me wit to plot this drift!"

But in F the passage stands thus:

"Loue lend me wings, to make my purpose swift
As thou hast lent me wit, to plot this drift."

Any reader who still thinks that F's punctuation in this play is Shakspere's or is delicate or dramatic, or worthy of preservation in a modern text, or that W is sincere in his pronouncements on F's punctuation, or has any logical principles guiding him in his punctuation of Shakspere's text, is beyond the reach of logic. To pursue this phase of our subject further would be useless. We therefore turn our attention now to another aspect of W's editorial labors.

In several instances he takes it upon himself to indicate in the text departures from modern usage in the accentuation of certain words. Thus, for example, he instructs his readers to say "péremptory" (I, iii, 71, although the verse may be read thus: "Excuse it not, for I'm perémptory."), "cónjure" (II, vii, 2) "charáctered" (II, vii, 4), "éxtreme" (II, vii, 22), "persévers" (III, ii, 28), "consórt" (IV, i, 64), "sepúlche" (IV, ii, 113) and "exíle" (V, iv, 156). That in this matter, too, W is not guided by any logical principle is evidenced by his failure to indicate similar deviations from modern accentuation in many other instances, as, for example, in I, i, 57, 61, 71 (where we should read "Mílan"), I, i, 60 ("likewíse"), I, ii, 36 ("conténts"), I, ii, 109 ("únkind"), I, ii, 124, and V, iv, 12 ("fórlorn), I, iii, 13, and III, i, 145 ("impórtune"), I, iii, 23 ("pérfected"), III, i, 258 ("North-gáte"), III, ii, 3 ("exíle"), III, ii, 6 ("imprέss"), III, ii, 60 and IV, ii, 4 ("accέss"), and IV, iii, 4, etc. ("Madám").

IV

W adds to his burdens the task of acting as stage-director for the benefit of the unimaginative reader. He presumes to be able to specify not only the actions and movements of the *dramatis personae* but even the tone of voice in which they deliver their speeches. There would be no great objection to this if W gave proof that he knows the play, is acquainted with the peculiarities of Elizabethan staging, has the faculty of visualizing the characters and the incidents, and is endowed with psychologic insight. Unfortunately for the reader, he shows little evidence of possessing these qualifications.

Because of some unreasonable prejudice, W refuses to

employ the conventional notations, *"Enter," "Exit,"* and *Exeunt,"* notations which all dramatists find satisfactory and which every reader understands. W prefers to have the characters *"come forth"* and *"depart"* or *"go their way"* or *"swagger off"* or *"go in to dinner,"* and so forth. When these stage-directions are correct, as they sometimes are, nothing is gained by the deviation from F; where they are incorrect, as they often are, much is lost.

"Discovery scenes," that is, scenes in which the characters are discovered on the stage at the opening of the scene, were, owing to the absence of a proscenium curtain, infrequent on the Elizabethan stage and must have been restricted to scenes which began on the rear stage behind the arras. On the Elizabethan stage—which Shakspere kept in mind when he wrote his plays—the personages usually walked on from the same or opposite doors or entrances at the opening of a scene and walked off or were carried off at the end of the scene. By the omission of the word *"Enter"* at the beginning of certain scenes, W gives the reader the erroneous impression that these are discovery scenes. He does this with I, i; II, i (?), ii, iv, v, vii; III, ii; IV, i, ii and iii.

W locates I, i, in *"Verona: a street near Julia's house,"* but Shakspere probably did not think of it in that way. He and his audience did not trouble to locate the scenes so definitely; for them it sufficed that two young men, evidently the "Two Gentlemen," were somewhere [in Verona] and were bidding each other farewell. There is nothing in the scene to suggest Julia's house. Intimate friends do not bid each other farewell in the highway. From a commonsense viewpoint we would say that the scene opens in Valentine's home or on the porch whither Proteus had come to bid his friend farewell if he could not persuade him to stay home. On Valentine's departure (on one side of the stage), Proteus turns to go (through a door on the other side of the stage) when he is encountered by the lazy, dilatory Speed. In other words, we have here a typically Elizabethan "split scene," a part of which is supposed to go on in one place (in Valentine's home) and the succeeding part in another place (the street in front of that house). It had been worth while, we think, to indicate at line 66 ("Thou, Julia, thou hast metamorphosed me") that Proteus is looking at a portrait of his beloved which he has about him. He is addicted to portraits.

Opposite I, i, 129, W says that Speed eyes the coin given him by Proteus *"with contempt;"* but this is more than questionable. It would have been more pertinent, though unnecessary, to say *"he pockets the gratuity."* Opposite line 139 Speed is instructed to deliver his speech *"dryly"*; a good actor would probably say it *"tantalizingly."* But such directions are wholly unnecessary and would be laughed at by actors; a text for general readers and students is not a playhouse copy, and the reader who would read such a text as W's may be presumed to have sufficient imagination to supply such "business" for himself and to know that at line 127 Proteus gives Speed a tip without having to read *"giving him money"* before the words "here is for your pains." Many of W's stage-directions are of this objectionable character, *e.g.*, *"sits"* (I, ii, 4), *"looks down"* (I, ii, 14), *"stamps"* (I, ii, 50), *"over her shoulder"* (I, ii, 88, *"bows low"* (II, i, 92), *"bows"* (II, i, 95), *"coldly"* (II, i, 108), *"flushing"** (II, i, 116), *"sighs"* (II, i, 163), *"sorrowfully"* (II, iii, 37), *"lightly"* (II, iv, 8), *"bowing"* (II, iv, 105), *"looks up"* (II, vii, 1), *"he takes him by the arm"* (III, i, 60), *"he turns on Valentine"* (III, i, 152), *"he Noses Valentine"* (III, i, 191), *"bends over him"* (III, i, 193), *"looks up"* (III, i, 208), etc. Needless to say, there is no limit to this sort of thing if an editor's conscience will permit him to indulge in such superfluities. Even at the best such directions are unpardonably presumptuous, but they are almost criminal when they are as poor and as often incorrect as W's are. Strangely enough, W fails to note opportunities for the indication of "business" which might really prove helpful. Thus, by way of example, at III, ii, 31, some readers might be helped by being told that Proteus speaks *"after pondering,"* or that he speaks III, ii, 46 *"with seeming reluctance."*

W heads I, ii, with the words *"A door opens: Julia and Lucetta come forth."* This does not tell the reader whether this is an indoor or an outdoor scene. Inasmuch as it is almost certain (from line 118) that the scene between the girls occurs in the open air, the editor should not have left the matter in doubt.

At I, ii, 103, and elsewhere, W has the stage-direction *"she goes within"*—which probably is not correct English

*How does an actor "flush" at will?

even in England now, but *"within"* is (presumably) more elegant than "in."

At the end of I, ii, W says that Julia and Lucetta *"go in to dinner"* where F says merely *"Exeunt."* W seems to forget that he is editing a play, not telling a story. The reader of a play thinks of the scenes on a stage and of the entrances and exits with reference to the stage and nothing else. Whether the characters go in to dinner or elsewhere is of no importance; what matters is that certain persons appear on the stage or leave it. From the fact that in this instance the reader has been told (line 131) that "Dinner is ready," he infers that Julia and Lucetta are supposed to be going in to dinner. The editor should credit his readers with at least that much intelligence.

Without a word of explanation, W locates II, i, in *"A street in Milan,"* although ever since Theobald all editors have located it within (!) *"the Duke's palace"* where, in a modern production, it should be. Valentine is much more likely to be loitering about the palace and (in the person of Speed) to find a glove of Silvia's there than in a street, and Silvia is much more likely to encounter him and perpetrate her little practical joke there. That the glove was not dropped by Valentine, though W says it was, is deducible from his surprise on beholding it ("Ha! let me see . . ."), from his saying to Launce "ay [= ah!] give it me," and from his rapturous "Sweet ornament, that decks [present tense !] a thing divine."

After II, i, 89, W says that *"Silvia approaches with her maid"* (F has no stage-direction, though one is needed) but he is in error in saying that she *"approaches."* Inasmuch as she engages in conversation with Valentine, it is certain that she entered. Furthermore, the dialogue gives no justification for the notation *"with her maid."* She is not chaperoned in other scenes, and there is no reason why it should be otherwise here. No other editor introduces a maid into this scene. The innovating W forgets all about the maid as the scene progresses; after line 128 Silvia *"bows and passes on,"* the maid having, presumably, melted away into air, thin air. It is worth noting, by the way, that F has the stage-direction *"Exit. Sil."* There is no maid in the list of *dramatis personae.*

W opens II, ii, with the notation, *"Verona: the street near Julia's house."* Some editors locate the scene within

"Julia's house." Knowing Shakspere's practice and the practice of his contemporaries, we know, of course, that Shakspere probably made no attempt to localize this scene. Lovers do not go through the formality of a betrothal, such as we have here, including "a holy kiss," the exchange of rings, the clasping of hands, and *"embracing"* in the public highway. Nor does a lady parting from a gentleman going on a trip weep in the street. Of course, the entry of Panthino in Julia's house is somewhat irregular but it is certainly the lesser of two evils. (In *Othello,* a much later play, Bianca seems to meet Cassio in Desdemona's chamber.) W does not mend matters by saying that *"Panthino appears in the* distance." If Panthino *"appears"* it constitutes an entry (unless W would have us think that an invisible Panthino shouts at Proteus from a distance) and the reader should be told so. W ends the scene with *"he* [Proteus] *goes,"* forgetting to get Panthino off the stage, though F says *"Exeunt."* This forgetfulness regarding Panthino's exit is puzzling in view of W's stage-direction in the next scene (II, iii, 33), *Panthino returns."* How can one who has not gone be said to return?

Scene 5 of Act II W locates in *"a street near the quay: an alehouse hard by,"* implying that the alehouse (or the entrance to it) is visible to the audience in the theatre. (He ends the scene with *"they enter the alehouse."*) But Shakspere's staging at this time was not given to such definite localization as this stage-direction implies. W is therefore misleading his uninitiated reader. His offence is aggravated by the fact that he insists that Shakspere's plays were acted continuously, without interruptions between successive scenes, and that therefore there could have been no definite localization of scenes on the stage. Perhaps it might be pointed out that W does not place II, i, *near an ordinary,* even though that scene ends with Speed's dragging Valentine off to dinner. There W is content to end the scene with *"they move on."* W is consistent only in being inconsistent.

Scene vi of this act opens with the direction *"Proteus slowly passes, on his way to the quay."* Nothing in the scene indicates that Proteus is in the street or walking; he may be thought of as sitting or standing or pacing up and down in his room. That he is not *"on his way to the quay"* is certain. Shakspere, in accordance with his usual technique, inserted II, v, between scenes iv and vi to give the

impression of a lapse of time since Proteus's arrival at the court. This effect is destroyed if we think of Proteus being on his way to the quay "to disembark some necessaries" (II, iv, 185-186). From what Proteus says to the Emperor-Duke in III, i, 6-7 ("when I call to mind your gracious favors to me") it is certain that he has been at the court at least several days, and therefore he cannot now be on his way to the quay. That the events of III, i, occur on the same day on which we overhear Proteus's soliloquy (II, vi, 1-43) is proved by the words "now presently I'll give her father notice of their disguising and pretended flight" (lines 36-37). The time analysis of this play is bad enough without W's making it worse, even though in this regard Shakspere was archaic, conventional and indifferent, as he was regarding place.

"Verona: a room in Julia's house" is W's heading to II, vii, although from line 82 it seems to be fairly certain that here Shakspere thought of the scene as being out-of-doors, perhaps again in the "garden" in which Capell and others locate I, ii. A further objection to W's management of this scene is his making it another discovery scene (*"Julia, studying a map; Lucetta, sewing"*). Strangely enough the scene ends with *"they go out"*—but this is preferable to *"they go within"* (see II, ii, 16). Nothing in the text warrants the assumption that the maid is sewing; she may be inviting a gentleman to supper!

Without going into details about W's management of the next scene (III, i) which, too, he treats as a "discovery" scene, we shall speak only of one feature of it. The discomfited, wretched, and asinine Valentine—a man who under such circumstances does not realize that he had been betrayed by his only confidant and counsellor is an ass—is instructed (after line 187) to bury his face *"on"* the gorund; but W does not explain how this wonderful feat is to be accomplished.

Probably without intending it, W has the Duke administer a snub to Proteus and Thurio at the end of III, ii. In line 96 Proteus says to the Duke "We'll wait upon your grace till after supper," and W adds the stage-direction *"following [the Duke]*," but the Duke dismisses them ("I will pardon you") and then we have the unnecessary, unwarranted and unjustiafiable stage-direction *"The Duke goes in to supper."* Such editorial liberties in what masquerades

as a scholarly edition are reprehensible beyond description.

An ordinary reader will be amazed to read (III, i, 191) that Launce *"noses Valentine."* Valentine, being a gentleman, would surely not feel complimented on learning that Lauce found him by his smell.

Linguistic affectation is responsible for an error in the caption heading IV, ii. A strip of garden is said to divide a wall from a lofty "turret," although the editor probably had a tower in mind. This caption is wrong also in its excessive and un-Elizabethan detail, in calling for *"a moonlit night"* and in omitting W's overworked "bench" on which the host falls asleep (unless W would have us believe that the Host slept while *"crouching behind a bush"* (IV, ii, 78). Shakspere must have meant the "pale queen of night" to come and go (as in *The Merchant of Venice*), otherwise we cannot understand why Silvia speaks to "gentlemen" after Thurio and the musicians had made their exit and why she did not recognize Proteus.

The elaborate stage-direction of which the above are parts (*"A wall, with a postern, behind the Duke's palace: inside a strip of garden dividing the wall from a lofty turret; outside, a narrow lane with bushes: a moonlit night"*) is something which Shakspere would never have thought of attempting, and which a modern reader cannot visualize without the aid of a diagram. W's pseudo-Elizabethan text (as regards pointing and scene divisions) combined with modernistic staging is, to say the least, "peculiar." Is there any reason for the wall's being "behind" the palace?

At the opening of IV, iv, W thinks it necessary to tell his readers that Launce is speaking *"to the dog,"* but he is wrong; Launce is addressing the audience. Had he been addressing his remarks to the dog he would not have spoken in the third person singular ("three or four of his blind brothers . . . I was sent to deliver him," etc.). On the Elizabethan stage it was not unusual for a character in a play to address the audience. Proteus does the same thing, somewhat less obviously, in his two long soliloquies. Anything done by an editor which tends to give a wrong impression of the customs, manners, and conventions of his author's milieu and of the author's technique is a betrayal of the reader's interest.

Between scenes iii and iv of Act IV W has the notation *"Six or seven hours pass,"* but one wonders how Shakspere

would have conveyed this information to his audience if scenes ii, iii and iv were acted continuously. If consistency seemed to enter into the formation of this text, one might inquire why such time notes do not appear in other parts of the play.

Act V, ii, is, according to W, another discovery scene, although a comic effect can be produced on the stage—and it must always be remembered that the play was written with the stage in mind—by representing Proteus as being pursued by the foolish Thurio, and Julia (disguised) following both.

Preceding V, iv, 13, W has the following stage-direction: *"He* [Valentine] *muses; cries and the sound of blows are heard."* There is nothing in the text to justify *"the sound of blows."* Nobody was beaten.

After line 18 W has Silvia come from the wood *"in disarray,"* implying that one of the outlaws had attempted to assault her and that Proteus had rescued her. The only possible justification for this is Proteus's statement that he had hazarded his life to rescue Silvia "from him That would have forc'd your honour and your love." But these words cannot apply to one of the outlaws; a rapist cannot be said to force his victim's honor and love. That Shakspere would have made one of his heroines the victim of two intended rapes, even in so poor a play as this is, in one scene, is utterly incredible. Nor can we believe that if such an attack had occurred something would not have been said about it either before or after the entry of the outlaws. Furthermore, the chivalric Robin Hood code by which Valentine's outlaw mates are bound would have made anything so dishonorable as an attempted rape by one of them impossible. They "detest such vile base practices" (IV, i, 73). What, then, does the "forced honor and love" refer to? The only explanation we can offer is this: part of this scene (lines 19-54), with the exception of lines 26-27 and 32) is the remnant of an earlier and now lost scene between Silvia and Proteus in which he tried to convince her that Valentine's intentions with regard to her had not been honorable and that he (Proteus) had saved her from him. That this play, as we have it in F, is Shakspere's unfinished revision of an older play we shall try to show from other lines of evidence as we proceed.

[*To be continued*]

PROVERBS AND *SENTENTIAE* IN THE PLAYS OF SHAKSPERE

By KATHERINE LEVER

IT is somewhat ironical that so many of the wise sayings of Shakspere, wise sayings frequently repeated and given to children for memorization, should be spoken by characters like Iago and Falstaff, whom the educators of the young would never hold up for emulation. The value of a good reputation has been demonstrated so convincingly in *Othello* that many quoters of the passage either forget that it is Iago, the destroyer of reputations, who speaks or else believe that the context is unimportant. It is impossible, however, for a student of Shakspere not to notice the deep and bitter irony of Iago's sententious remarks, and equally impossible not to wonder whether Shakspere himself might not have thought cynically of those aphorisms which have contributed so much to his reputation for wisdom. These doubts raise the whole problem of the function of proverbs and sententious remarks in the plays of Shakspere: a problem which this paper attempts to solve.

INTRODUCTION

First, then, what are proverbs and *sententiae?* That this is no easy question to answer is shown by Professor B. J. Whiting in his article, "The Nature of the Proverb."[1] Mr. Whiting outlines here the history of the many attempts to define a proverb, none of which has been completely sucful. His own conclusion is more like an analysis than a definition.

> A proverb is an expression, which, owing its birth to the people, testifies to its origin in form and phrase. It expresses what is apparently a fundamental truth,—that is, a truism,—in homely language, often adorned, however, with alliteration and rhyme. It is usually short but need not be; it is usually true, but need not be. Some proverbs have both a literal and a figurative meaning either of which makes perfect sense; but more often they have but one of the two. A proverb must be venerable; it must have the sign of antiquity . . .[2]

Even more important for our purpose is Mr. Whiting's division of proverbial literature into three classes. The

[1] *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature,* vol. XIV, Cambridge, 1932.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 302.

first, the proverb proper, has already been defined. The third, the sententious remark, he describes as a "piece of wisdom which has not crystallized into specific current form."[3] It may be distinguished from a proverb "because it is heavy and amorphous in comparison with the popular product."[4] The second variety is the proverbial phrase, of which nothing will be said in this paper. Such proverbial phrases as "against the hair," which Shakspere uses instead of the current "against the grain," are interesting chiefly from a linguistic point of view. Mere references to proverbs (when the proverbs are not actually quoted) lie also beyond the scope of the present investigation.

My terminology differs from Mr. Whiting's only in that I have preferred to use the Latin word *sententia* rather than "sententious remark," because it is less clumsy. Another possibility, the Elizabethan term "sentence," suggests brevity and does not convey to the modern mind the implications of thought or philosophical proposition which are contained in the word *sententia.*

Clearly, the distinction between *sententia* and proverb is, at best, a shadowy one. It sometimes happens, indeed, that "what was originally a sententious remark, perhaps a bit of philosophy or a quotation from the Bible, comes to be considered a proverb."[5] Wherever it is necessary to distinguish between these two classes, I have depended upon the *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs,* in which the occurrence of proverbs before Shakspere's time is noted. Often, however, it is unimportant to discriminate between *sententia* and proverbs, and in such cases the wider term, generalization, is used.

A generalization is a product of *thought,* and it makes no difference whether the generalization is a *sententia* or a proverb. If it is a *sententia,* the speaker usually believes that he is expressing an opinion which he has himself formed or, at least, which he has made sufficiently his own to be able to replace it in his own words. If it is a proverb, the process of thought is slightly different, but thought is no less present. To use a proverb correctly implies that the speaker has understood the general exemplified in the par-

[3] "The Nature of the Proverb," p. 306.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 306.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

ticular act and has simply repeated the rule in the form in which he has heard it before. To use a proverb incorrectly, implies a corresponding lack of intelligence.

Shakspere wrote when the popularity of the proverb was at high tide. Native proverbs had begun to appear in England as early as the eighth century and throughout the middle ages they had increased in number and currency. But it was not until the sixteenth century that the collection and conscious use of proverbs became the fashion for scholars and writers. It was during this century, also, that there occurred in England the great influx of German, French, Italian, and classical proverbs, a trend considered by Dr. Morris Palmer Tilley as "the characteristic feature of Elizabethan proverbs in contrast with English proverbs before that time."[6]

Knowledge of proverbs was spread through books like the *Adagia* of Erasmus and John Heywood's *Dialogue conteining the Number of the Effectual Proverbes in the Englishe Tounge,* both books widely read in the sixteenth century. The publication of *Euphues* and of Pettie's *Pallace* made the use of proverbs the cult of the literary coteries of the day. Ben Jonson and Henry Porter mocked at the overuse of proverbs, but their words had almost no effect upon the proverb's popularity in the seventeenth century.

It was not until the eighteenth century that the tide really began to turn, hastened in its course by the disdain of Lord Chesterfield and the biting satire of Jonathon Swift. However, the sententious remark was still held in high repute, and it is only in comparatively recent times that the word "sententious" has acquired the meaning of pompous moralizing.

Was Shakspere, as a young man, attracted by the Euphuistic use of proverbs as literary embellishments or did he become "preachy" as he grew older, and filled his later plays with *sententiae*? Neither hypothesis is supported by my statistics. *Love's Labor's Lost* contains over thirty generalizations; but other relatively early plays, such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream, King John,* and *The Comedy of Errors,* contains an average of only twelve generalizations apiece. The four great tragedies have many general-

[6] *Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Lyly's "Euphues" and in Pettie's "Petite Pallace" with parallels from Shakespeare,* New York, 1926, p. 1.

izations, but among Shakspere's latest works, *A Winter's Tale, Cymbeline,* and *The Tempest* average, like the early plays, only about twelve generalizations each. *Hamlet* has forty-four, more than any other play; *Twelfth Night,* written about the same time, has only fourteen.

However, the statistics are not entirely without significance, for it is clear that the number of generalizations depends upon the type of play. Farces like *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *The Taming of the Shrew,* in which the development of the plot is the focus of attention, have the fewest. The largest number of generalizations appears in tragedies wherein the element of thought is prominent. The histories and the higher comedies fall in between.

Of course, the many generalizations in plays like *Hamlet* and *Measure for Measure* are to a large extent the instruments by which the impression of thoughtfulness is created. But it is my contention that those serious plays contain characters and situations which are by their very nature productive of proverbs and sententious remarks. Let us examine the nature of these characters and situations more closely.

Six "Sententious" Characters

Six characters express their thoughts most frequently in a general form. They are Iago, Hamlet, the Duke in *Measure for Measure,* Polonius, Ulysses, and Berowne. What a heterogeneous group they seem to be! There are young men and old men, villains and heroes, tragic and comic figures—men who apparently have nothing in common. There is, however, one characteristic which they all possess—intellectuality. They are all thinking men. They think different things and they think in different ways, but all have advanced from the perceptual level of intelligence to the conceptual.

This statement would be acceptable to almost everyone, I believe, though possible objection might be made to the inclusion of one character. How can it be said that Polonius, doddering old foolish Polonius, is an intelligent man? Hamlet certainly makes Polonius seem ridiculous and his sententiousness is apt to be boring, but there are two considerations which ought to make us at least pause and think before we accept the traditional view. A clever man like

Claudius, King of Denmark, would not be likely to have a fool for his councillor. And the advice of Polonius to his son is shrewd and sound. It was by following those principles, we may suppose, that Polonius had attained the high position in the court which he held. Laertes would have done well had he also followed them.

It may still be objected that Polonius's statements are trite and "sententious." The only answer to one who speaks thus is to bid him brush aside the centuries which have intervened and to place himself in the position of a spectator at the first performance of *Hamlet.* No one has ever said to him,

> Neither a borrower nor a lender be;
> For loan oft loses both itself and friend,
> And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.[7]

He has never had it drilled into him by teachers and clergymen that he should to his own self be true, or to "give every man his ear, but few his voice."[8] He, as an Elizabethan, has doubtless heard similar thoughts expresesd but he enjoys the clever, antithetical way in which they are spoken here. He and the rest of the audience like these maxims because, as Aristotle says, people "are delighted when a general statement of the speaker hits those opinions which they hold in a particular case."[9] To an Elizabethan, then, these generalizations would not be trite, and their sententiousness would be to his liking.

An amusing instance of the clever way in which Shakspere uses contrast is in making Polonius utter the famous words, "brevity is the soul of wit."[10] This generalization has been quoted so frequently since its first enunciation that it has now become proverbial, but there is no earlier reference to it in the *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs.*

The mind of Polonius is not a deep one. He is not concerned with anything beyond material success in a materialistic world, but to understand how to make the best impression on other men and how to gain and keep their friendship is not an accomplishment to be scorned. He is

---

[7]*Hamlet,* I, iii, 75. All Shaksperian quotations are from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare,* ed. George L. Kittredge, Boston, 1936.
[8]*Ibid.,* I, iii, 68.
[9]Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* ii, 21.
[10]*Hamlet,* II, ii, 90.

neither witty nor philosophical, but he is shrewd, and shrewdness is a form of intelligence.

No such justification is needed for the next character. The keenness of Iago's mind is undisputed, but what a warped intelligence it is! He offers no advice to another which is not determined by his own self-interest. To patient Roderigo, Iago says,

> How poor are they that have not patience!
> What wound did ever heal but by degrees?
> Thou know'st we work by wit, and not by witchcraft;
> And wit depends on dilatory time.[11]

Twenty lines later, when Roderigo has gone, Iago contradicts his former statement that "wit depends on dilatory time," and says, "Dull not device by coldness and delay."

Self-contradiction for the sake of advantage is to be expected in a villain, and is shocking but not horrifying. What makes our blood curdle is the frequent use of generalizations with double meanings. Iago says to Othello,

> To be direct and honest is not safe;[12]

and later,

> for honesty's a fool
> And loses that it works for.[13]

Othello thinks that Iago is protesting against the accusation of dishonesty made against him. The audience, however, would understand that these generalizations apply with much more truth to Othello himself. Another and better-known example of the way in which Iago masks his true feelings behind sententious remarks occurs earlier in the same scene. At the very moment in which he is about to ruin a man's reputation, he discourses on its pricelessness; when he is devoting his whole energy and intelligence to arousing deadly jealousy in Othello, he warns Othello to beware of jealousy because it destroys its possessors. One last example is his remark, "Pleasure and action make the hours seem short."[14] How true that is! we are tempted to think. How true, but how horrible when we remember what the pleasure and the action are to which Iago refers!

Polonius gives advice; Iago uses generalizations to further his own wicked designs; Hamlet speaks in the majority

---

[11] *Othello,* II, iii, 376.
[12] *Othello,* III, iii, 378.
[13] *Ibid.,* III, iii, 382.

of cases for his own satisfaction. The philosophical turn of Hamlet's mind is most clearly marked, I think, in the grave-diggers' scene; here, although he is ostensibly talking to Horatio, he seems to be thinking aloud rather than addressing any one. His soliloquies, since they are spoken thoughts, naturally contain many generalizations, but the more interesting generalizations are those uttered when others are listening but are not being addressed directly. A good example is in the first act when Horatio, Marcellus and Hamlet are waiting for the ghost. Horatio has asked Hamlet about the flourish of trumpets. Hamlet explains the custom and then continues with the observation about the "vicious mole of nature."[15] His remarks, interrupted by the ghost and by Horatio's cry, are of little external value; that is, they neither carry on the action nor directly affect the characterization, except in so far as they reveal early in the play Hamlet's interest in philosophy. Their intrinsic value is, of course, unquestioned.

Hamlet was a student, with the reflective mind of a student. When he is alone his thoughts often take a general form, and also (and this is an interesting point) when he is with Horatio. I have already mentioned two scenes in which he talks freely to, or in the presence of, Horatio, and there is another which ought to be mentioned. In the second scene of the fifth act Hamlet is telling Horatio how he escaped from the ship which was carrying him to England. He says,

> Sir, in my heart there was a kind of fighting
> That would not let me sleep. Methought I lay
> Worse than the mutines in the bilboes. Rashly—
> And prais'd be rashness for it; let us know,
> Our indiscretion sometime serves us well
> When our deep plots do pall; and that should learn us
> There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough-hew them how we will—
> *Horatio.* That is most certain.
> *Hamlet.* Up from my cabin, . . .[16]

Notice how Hamlet starts to tell his story, beginning with the word "rashly," and then is diverted from it by the idea which occurs to him that rashness is not always the fault

[14] *Ibid.*, II, iii, 385.
[15] *Hamlet*, I, iv, 24 ff.
[16] *Ibid.*, 4.

it is commonly thought to be. The realization that deep plots fail suggests the further reflection that there is something beyond and above us which controls our actions. Where this idea might have led, we do not know because Horatio interrupts him, prompted by a desire to hear the story.

But Hamlet's mind was keen and piercing, as well as reflective. When he is with Rosencrantz and Guildernstern, Polonius, or the King, his generalizations are bitter and cynical. For instance, Rosencrantz says, "I understand you not, my lord." To which Hamlet replies, "I am glad of it. A knavish speech sleeps in a foolish ear."[17] The proverb, "The cat will mew, and dog will have his day," is flung as an insult at the King by Hamlet as he leaves the stage.[18]

Hamlet's cynicism is intensified by the political gladhands offered him by Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, and Polonius. The sweetness with which they try to coat their true purposes exasperates him into saying things like, "Use every man after his desert, and who should scape whipping?"[18] and "To be honest, as this world goes, is to be one man pick'd out of ten thousand."[20]

The generalizations of the Duke in *Measure for Measure* have a mellow quality quite different from the penetration of those of Hamlet. The Duke had always "lov'd the life removed."[21] His remarks at the beginning disclose a calm mind observing the world by the light of reason and unaffected by strong emotions. For example,

> Heaven doth with us as we with torches do,
> Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
> Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
> As if we had them not.[22]

How different is his soliloquy after he has learned Angelo's trickery and immediately following his first conversation with Lucio!

> Nor might nor greatness in mortality
> Can censure scape. Back-wounding calumny
> The whitest virtue strikes. What king so strong
> Can tie the gall up in the sland'rous tongue?[23]

---

[17] IV, ii, 24.
[18] V, i, 315.
[19] II, ii, 555.
[20] II, ii, 178.
[21] *Measure for Measure,* I, iii, 8.
[22] *Ibid.,* I, i, 33.
[23] *Ibid.,* III, ii, 196.

At the end of the play, when virtue is about to be rewarded, he resumes his calm, reasonable attitude toward life. It is fitting that he should be the one to point the moral of the play with these words,

> Haste still pays haste, and leisure answers leisure;
> Like doth quit like, and Measure still for Measure.[24]

Ulysses is a wise and clever councillor whose main concern is to bring the expedition against Troy to as speedy conclusion as possible. His long experience as one of the leaders of the army has sharpened his naturally keen insight into the ways of mankind, and the fruits of this experience are given to us in two long speeches. This use of generalizations as forensic weapons will be discussed later.

Berowne, in *Love's Labor's Lost,* differs from the other characters in this group because of his gaiety of spirit. He is a young man, witty and clever rather than a deep and philosophical thinker. Indeed, he thinks that the life of complete seclusion and study is not only impossible to sustain for long but not even worth the effort. He says in defense of his position,

> Study is like the heaven's glorious sun,
> That will not be deep search'd with saucy looks.
> Small have continual plodders ever won
> Save base authority from others' books.
> These earthly godfathers of heaven's lights
> That give a name to every fixëd star
> Have no more profit of their shining nights
> Than those that walk and wot not what they are.
> Too much to know is to know naught but fame;
> And every godfather can give a name.[25]

We may not agree with Berowne; but Ferdinand is certainly right when he says,

> How well he's read, to reason against reading![26]

Sententiae and Character

Corresponding to these individual characters are five main types of characters who are prone to generalize: villains, tragic heroes, dukes and kings, wise old councillors, and young men in comedies.

Edmund, in *King Lear,* echoes Iago when he says, "This

[24] *Ibid.,* V, i, 415.
[25] I, i, 84.
[26] I, i, 94.

is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behaviour, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars."[27] The analogous passage in *Othello* is, " 'Tis in ourselves that we are thus or thus."[28] It is interesting that the other, more famous, expression of this same *sententia* is spoken by Cassius:

> The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
> But in ourselves, that we are underlings.[29]

The comment made by Cæsar about Cassius, "he thinks too much,"[30] is significant in this connection.

Edmund, Iago, Cassius, all clever, scheming, unscrupulous men, hold the same philosophy of life. This is not accidental but the natural consequence of the sound characterization of such men. These men believe in themselves. They trust no one but themselves and found their hopes for success only upon their own abilities. Therefore, to admit that some power greater than man could influence the course of human events would be to admit an element of chance which might wreck even their best-laid plans. Edmund alone, when he is dying, recognizes the influence of fortune and the inability of man to be completely his own master.

Of the tragic heroes other than Hamlet, Brutus and Macbeth generalize most frequently, Antony and Troilus the least, which is not surprising considering the respective characters of the men. Brutus expresses in some of his soliloquies what are, to me, at any rate, some of the most profound and original ideas to be found in all of Shakspere's works. One of the finer examples is,

> Between the acting of a dreadful thing
> And the first motion, all the int'rim is
> Like a phantasma or a hideous dream.
> The genius and the mortal instruments
> Are then in council, and the state of man,
> Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
> The nature of an insurrection.[31]

Macbeth has only three long soliloquies in the whole play, and in the first two he is concentrating so completely

[27] I, ii, 128.
[28] I, iii, 322.
[29] *Julius Caesar,* I, ii, 140.
[30] *Ibid.,* , ii, 195.
[31] *Ibid.,* II, i, 63.

upon the immediate business at hand that he generalizes little. Except for the last well-known soliloquy, almost all of his generalizations are rhyme tags or only one line long. His few *sententiae* are like glowering clouds foreboding rain, not unlike the *sententiae* so frequently found in Greek choruses:

> False face must hide what the false heart doth know.[32]

Or again,

> Words to the heat of deeds too cold breath gives.[33]

Macbeth twice uses proverbs in a very dramatic way. One very old proverb, "God beginning maketh god endynge,"[34] becomes in Macbeth's mouth,

> Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill.[35]

Another old proverb is not changed but repeated with ominous effect:

> It will have blood, they say; blood will have blood.[36]

Of the three remaining types of characters only a few words need be said. The kings generalize occasionally, as is natural for those in authority. The king in *Hamlet* has generalizations to speak, because he is also a villain, and Henry the Fourth, in the second play, because he is at the point of death. Although no one councillor, except Polonius and Ulysses, uses many generalizations, no group is so widely represented. In the history plays, especially, almost every one of the advisors of the king or his rival lets fall an occasional *sententia* or proverb during the course of the play. Of the young men in comedies, Claudio is an exceptional case because he is at the point of death, which, as we shall see later, is apt to make a person philosophical. Benedick quotes proverbs in his sparring with Beatrice, and Valentine and Proteus are full of conventional *sententiae* about life and love.

There are three other types of characters, not represented in our first list of characters, who frequently couch their opinions in general form. They are friars, fools, and women. The friar is really just a special kind of a councilor, and in his advisory capacity naturally resorts to general statements. This is clearly indicated by the rôle played by the Friar in *Romeo and Juliet.*

[*To be continued*]

---

[32] *Macbeth,* I, vii, 82.
[33] *Ibid.,* II, i, 61.
[34] *Proverbs of Hending,* ii.
[35] *Macbeth,* III, ii, 55.
[36] *Ibid.,* III, iv, 122.

SHAKSPERE'S PHILOSOPHICAL PATTERNS

By ROBERT M. SMITH

PROFESSOR CURRY'S *Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns*[1] is an ambitious and misleading title for two profound and illuminating studies of *Macbeth* and *The Tempest.* A better title would have been *Philosophical Patterns in Macbeth and The Tempest,* for Professor Curry does not at all contend that Shakspere's philosophy can be found in his plays. Carefully, wisely, and repeatedly he guards himself against any such dangerous assumption:

> "The dramatic artist is rarely, if ever, a philosopher in the sense that he builds a philosophical system of his own—he is always primarily the creative artist and not the philosopher" (p. 210) . . . "to reconstruct an author's point of view from the philosophical content of a drama is a futile procedure" (p. 212) . . . Shakspere's "intimate 'philosophy of life', if he had one, does not seem to be recoverable by means of any analysis or synthesis of his plays. He was neither prophet nor teacher" (p. ix).

Such a sound preliminary contention does not mean, however, that Shakspere does not appropriate and utilize in his plays philosophical concepts prevalent in his day. Perhaps the most basic of these, as a number of valuable books have recently been pointing out, is the medieval philosophical system.[2] In *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies* Professor W. W. Lawrence wrote a definitive book illustrating the influence of medieval story-telling and convention on the so-called 'dark' comedies. Preceding Professor Curry's valuable study, came Hardin Craig's *The Enchanted Glass,* cursed with unreadability, and Theodore Spencer's *Death in Elizabethan Drama,* a good preliminary to the most thorogoing and valuable of all discussions of medievalism in the English drama, Willard Farnham's *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy.* After studying these books no one is likely to indulge again in that easy

---

[1]Louisiana State University Press, 1937.

[2]See many other articles listed in G. C. Taylor's *The Medieval Element in Shakspere.*

generalization that Shakspere was primarily a Renaissance artist and thinker.

Readers of *Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns* will do well after reading the "Introduction" to turn directly to Professor Curry's essay on *Patterns* in the Appendix in order to find a clarification of his point of view, and further definitions and terms. There are many patterns to be found in poetic drama—metrical, rhythmic, chronological, atmospheric, logical, psychological, allegorical, but the all-integrating and absorbing principle is the philosophical pattern.

Professor Curry demonstrates that Shakspere, though a completely objective dramatist, utilized in *Macbeth* and *The Tempest* philosophical principles from two directly contrasting systems. *Macbeth* is fundamentally medieval and Christian; *The Tempest* is Neo-Platonic, and essentially classical and pagan in spirit. Each play carries its own philosophical patterns, and is an artistic law to itself; in fact—and this is Professor Curry's main thesis—"each of Shakespeare's individual dramas is a unique world unto itself, governed by its proper laws, peopled by its special characters, and integrated by a philosophical pattern separate and distinct from all others." It is doubtful whether such a thesis does not stress too heavily the presence of philosophical patterns in all the plays. For some of them, especially the tragedies, it holds better than for the comedies. It might be difficult for Professor Curry to find a philosophical pattern shaping and controlling, for example, *The Comedy of Errors, The Two Gentlemen,* or *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* but he is quite right in contending that the plays cannot be grouped together and reduced to a philosophical system.

Professor Curry also refutes again for us the "tough legend," as he characterizes it, that the Renaissance disowned its medieval heritage in matters philosophical. On the contrary, the scholastic synthesis is a form of thinking and a way of life that has never disappeared; it still recruits large numbers of followers in fervent periods of Catholic and Anglo-Catholic revival, as under Newman and Pusey

in the 19th century, and finds new converts daily in a world seemingly given over completely to violence and destruction.

The tragedy of *Macbeth,* perhaps more than any other play, is dominated throughout by the demonic metaphysics of medieval thought; the Weird Sisters are intended to symbolize or represent the metaphysical world of evil spirits, essentially tragic beings who, for the sake of certain abnormal powers, have sold themselves to the devil. Evil under this system is revealed in two modes or categories, objectively as the malignant activity of demons or fallen angels, and subjectively in the human spirit as original or other sin. Both Macbeth and Lady Macbeth by "free, creative action" have embraced these murdering ministers who progressively destroy them.

> "Macbeth never loses completely the liberty of free choice which is the supreme *bonum naturae* of mankind. . . . Thus the Fate which broods over Macbeth may be identified with that disposition inherent in all created things . . . by which providence knits all things in their proper order. . . . One may well stand in awe of such a being, indissolubly linked in essence to the natural and divine forces which govern the universe; and one may exult in the possibility of his exercising free volition even to his own salvation and damnation. We may pity the individual's bewilderment, suffering, and misdirected struggle for happiness, but the man's infallible response to the appearance of good must arouse our respect and admiration."

Instead of the demoniacal fallen angels of the Christian system in *Macbeth,* we find in *The Tempest* the hierarchy of Neo-Platonic dæmons, which control the activities of nature and mediate between gods and men. Prospero is the sacred personage or Theurgist, *i.e.,* the scientist who sets about controlling the activities of nature through the subjugation of its guardian spirits to his will. He is the wise philosopher-magician who employs beneficent spirits for benevolent purposes; he exemplifies White Magic. The foul Witch Sycorax, on the other hand, who, cohabiting with an aquatic dæmon, produces Caliban, practices Black Magic—goetical art as contrasted with theurgical art. Prospero abandons the theurgical art when, after forgiving his enemies, he wishes to take the final step and consummate

the assimilation of his soul to the gods. His ending is despair, unless he is relieved by prayer, since true prayer for the Neo-Platonist elevates the soul to the gods, and when elevated conjoins it as much as possible with them.

Professor Curry's interpretation of Neo-Platonism in *The Tempest* will be found to rest upon weaker foundations than his findings of medieval Christian thought in *Macbeth*. To round out his Neo-Platonic argument he needs Prospero's farewell epilogue as the final aspiration of the Platonic soul heavenward. Though many critics still persist in identifying this epilogue with Shakspere's personal farewell to his art, since the days of Richard Grant White and Furness there have been critics who believe on good grounds that Shakspere did not write it, and recently other critics, like Stoll, have stigmatized the epilogue as the veriest drivel and doggerel.

> "One hopes that those sorry lines are not by Shakspere . . . the Epilogue is nothing more than a series of wire-drawn conceits on the subject of pardon and indulgence . . ." (P. M. L. A., Vol 47, p. 704).

Such critical considerations do some damage to Professor Curry's argument, and may serve as a warning not to impose philosophical systems too heavily on Shakspere's plays.

To the support of his interpretation of both *Macbeth* and *The Tempest* Professor Curry brings learned expositions of scholastic and neo-pagan doctrines from the philosophical monuments. It is to be hoped that he will study *Lear* and other tragedies, since so far he has been scrupulously careful not to claim a philosophy for his author, or to contend that Shakspere was as learned in the scholastic and neo-platonic books as the critic who draws from them the light which they cast on philosophical patterns in the plays.

Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pa.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

SONNET 20

Shakspere's twentieth sonnet has been most curiously, if not perversely, misunderstood. Many readers and—what is even more strange—reputed Shaksperian scholars have regarded this sonnet as the poet's confession of being homosexually bound to a "man right fair." What is amazing about this is the fact that this sonnet furnishes an explicit, direct, and unequivocal denial of any such relationship. It is almost as if Shakspere, anticipating such a charge, had decided to set himself right with the world and leave no loop to hang a doubt on.

In the past two or three years several writers on the *Sonnets* have attacked this problem—needlessly, of course. The latest of these is Mr. Walter Thomson,* who attempts to give Shakspere a clean bill of health by maintaining (with some of his predecessors) that the word "passion"—in the obscure words "master-mistress of my passion"—means "poem" (a meaning which the word undoubtedly sometimes had in Shakspere's day) and that the more difficult expression, "master-mistress" means a man (Henry Wriothesley!) with a woman's features. That these words bear these meanings here may well be doubted. The Earl of Southampton does not look like a woman in any of his paintings; for one thing, his beard (worn when he was only 21 years old!) forbids me to think so. "Passion" may mean nothing more than "affection," just as "lover" often meant no more than "friend" to Shakspere and his contemporaries; "master-mistress" probably means "the male who stands in the place of a female (in my devotion)." To Elizabethans these exaggerated expressions would have seemed perfectly appropriate when used in connection with an intimate and loyal friend. If Shakspere had thought that they could or would be interpreted as a revelation of a homosexual relationship, he would not have permitted them to be circulated (as Meres tells us they were) "among his private friends."

The denial of inversion (to use a less hackneyed term) is contained in the last four lines of the sonnet in question. To understand them the reader need only bear in mind Shakspere's addiction to punning.

> Till Nature, as she wrought thee, fell a-doting,
> And by addition me of thee defeated,
> By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
> But since she prickt thee out for women's pleasure,
> Mine be thy love, and thy love's use their treasure.

Inasmuch as commentators are too squeamish to interpret these lines for the simple-minded reader, we shall paraphrase them here: "While Nature (conceived as a female—"as *she* wrought thee") was forming thee as a female in thy mother's womb, she fell in love with you and decided to add something (a phallus) to your body whilch would transform you into a male; by this addition she cheated me of you, for this thing which she added is of no value to me ("to my purpose nothing"). Well, then, since nature equipped you with an organ which is framed to give pleasure only to women, give me your affection and satisfy your sexual urge upon them."

**The Sonnets of William Shakespeare and Henry Wriothesley . . . Together with "A Lover's Complaint" and "The Phoenix & Turtle,"* by Walter Thomson; printed & sold for the Editor by B. Blackwell & H. Young & Sons, Liverpool, pp. viii, 200; 12s. 6d.

SONNET SPECULATIONS

In the book we have just noticed—a very engaging and readable but wholly unconvincing book—the courageous author and editor argues for the following propositions: Shakspere wrote only about 100 of the sonnets usually credited to him; these *Sonnets* were inspired by the Earl of Southampton; "Mr. W. H." of the dedication is a dual personality consisting of W[illiam Shakspere] and H[enry Wriothesley]—an ingeniously fantastic suggestion which may take its place alongside the "William Himself" absurdity; the greater number of the remaining 54 sonnets were probably written by the Earl of Southampton or "were collected by him"; Shakspere was involved in two unhappy amours (related in the *Sonnets*) and two quarrels with Southampton; Shakspere had "very little or no hand in the Dark Woman series" (127 to 153); the Phoenix of *The Phoenix & Turtle* ("an essential part of the Sonnet story") is Southampton; in *A Lover's Complaint* Shakspere gives us "a peep into the close affectionate relationship between him and the young Southampton;" the *Sonnets* were stolen from Southampton's library by someone for Thorpe; and so forth. In the course of the book Alexander Schmidt and Samuel Butler come in for a long and thorough drubbing, the former for his definition of the words "passion" and "master-mistress," the latter for his homosexual interpretation of Sonnet 20. Of course, the homosexual theory was old before either of these scholars wrote on the *Sonnets*.

The trouble with Mr. Thomson's book is that it presents not a particle of what might be regarded as evidence, external or internal, in substantiation of his views; a much bigger and duller book could be written to disprove his theses. But we are grateful to him for a nicely printed book and a well-edited presentation of the poems involved in his discussion.

ANOTHER *HAMLET**

The Princeton University Press has just published an edition of *Hamlet* with a learned introduction and commentary by two distinguished scholars, Professors T. M. Parrot and H. Craig. The publisher says (on the jacket) that this book gives us "a text which is undoubtedly nearer to the text of the play as Shakespeare actually wrote it than is any previous version." The editors tell us that their purpose was "to produce an edition at once readable and critical of the authentic text," and that therefore they have given us a critical edition of the second quarto (1604). Many of our readers probably know that this means that our editors have swallowed—hook, line, and sinker—Professor Dover Wilson's views regarding this play. In so doing they have committed themselves to some of the unsoundest, most unscholarly literary speculations of recent times. Professor Wilson's notions about what he calls "scientific bibliography" are so wild and unscientific, such wholly arbitrary assumptions, that his conclusions have not the slightest validity. To base an edition of the play on his work is, therefore, to render the scholar a decided disservice. Fortunately, notwithstanding the editors' assertion to the contrary, this book is so unreadable as a *Hamlet* text, that not many are likely to play havoc with their temper by attempting it. Few modern readers will waste their time on a

**The Tragedy of Hamlet: A Critical Edition of the Second Quarto, 1604, with Introduction and textual notes;* edited by Thomas Marc Parrott & Hardin Craig; Princeton: Princeton University Press 1938; pp. x, 247; $3.50.

book which prints passages like the following:

> Or if thou hast vphoorded in thy life
> Extorted treasure in the womb of earth
> For which they say you spirits oft walke in death,
> Speake of it, stay and speake, stop it Marcellus.

The editors object to "all modern texts" for being "a conflation of those presented in the Second Quarto and the First Folio;" but, if we are any judges, their text is so too, inasmuch as they frequently abandon Q2 in favor of a Folio reading.

The essential defect of this book—apart from its adoption of most of the Quarto's wretched, chaotic punctuation—may be illustrated by its comment on the word "bands," in I, ii, 24. (The Folio reads "Bonds.") The editors say: "Shakespeare made little or no distinction between these interchangeable terms. F[olio] represents modernization." Let us examine these statements. Inasmuch as both "band" and "bond" were in general use throughout the Middle English period, and to Shakspere they were "interchangeable," there is no propriety in calling the Folio's word a "modernization"; as far as we know, "bond"—the better of the two words—goes back to the early 13th century and therefore has as venerable a lineage as "band." Furthermore, there is not the slightest shadow of justification for misleading students and readers into thinking that the word "band" was archaic or falling into disuse when the Folio was being prepared for publication.

And, thirdly and lastly, the most probable explanation—in view of many similar variations in the Q and F texts—is that "bonds" and "bands" may be due merely to slight differences in the chirography of the scribes who prepared the "copies" used in printing these texts. Shakspere's *o* probably often looked like an *a*, and his *a* often looked like an *o*; or the scribe's *o's* and *a's* may sometimes have been indistinguishable. What Shakspere intended cannot, therefore, be determined. To assume, therefore, that Q2 rather than F1 gives us Shakspere's intention in the matter is to be guilty of bad logic and bad scholarship, especially when we remember that F1 has the authority of Heminge and Condell. If Shakspere introduced alterations into his work after its original composition, those revisions represent his maturer judgment and are, therefore, to be preferred to what he deliberately rejected.

Had Professors Parrott and Craig given us a scholarly and modernized text which included the very sensible and judicious notes which they give us here and there, we should have hailed this book with delight. As it is, we do not like it.

THE AMERICAN WAY?

About ten days ago substantially the following telephonic conversation took place:

"Hello! I wish to speak to Dr. T."

"Speaking."

"I am the manager of the sales department of ————" (a prominent New York Bookseller).

"What can I do for you?"

"We received from you a copy of a book, a bibliography of Ben Jonson, together with a bill for $5 and postage."

"Yes."

"You know that we expect a discount of 50 per cent on all books we sell. These books go to University libraries and we are their agents."

"There is no discount on these books; the edition printed is so small and the cost of production so high that I cannot give a discount to a dealer who does no more than trans-

mit an order he received because of my circularization of the libraries."

"Doctor, don't you know that librarians insist on getting a discount, so that they can show their donors how careful they are in spending the money given them? If you want to get $5 for your book you must market it for $7.50."

"But, my dear sir, at $7.50 I can't expect to dispose of as many copies as at $5, and I do not think it fair to soak a library $7.50 for a book which I think should sell for $5."

"Well, doctor, that's the American way."

Will someone be good enough to inform us whether this is really the American way of doing business? Or is it a "racket" in which certain librarians cheat the library chest by dividing the commission with the bookseller? An investigation is in order.

CONTRIBUTED

To the Editor:

Some time ago I became convinced that a passage in Shakspere's "Macbeth" does not mean what both stage and editorial presentations make it mean. The passage is at the beginning of Act II. Banquo and his son, Fleance, are shown in "A Court in Macbeth's Castle."

> *"Banquo:* How goes the night, boy?
> *Fleance:* The moon is down; I have not heard the clock.
> *Banquo:* And she goes down at twelve.
> *Fleance:* I take't 'tis later, sir.
> *Banquo:* Hold, take my sword. There's husbandry in heaven!
> Their candles are all out. Take thee that, too . . ."

In commenting upon "Take thee that, too," all the editors to whom I have had access (in Furness's Variorum edition and many later editions), if they commented upon this passage at all, have suggested for a stage direction, or at least in a note for explanatory business, that Banquo hands Fleance a dagger or some other part of his armor. In a recent stage performance of the play Banquo took off his huge cloak and piled it upon the boy's outstretched arm. But there was no accompanying business to indicate a reason for this. It seemed totally uncalled for, except as one way of following the text. The same thought applied to Banquo's giving his sword to Fleance. Why does he give his sword to Fleance? Almost immediately his tense "Give me my sword," line 10; and then his nervous "Who's there?" indicate that in that time and place his arms were worn for expected service.

It seems to me that there is a pun on the word, *take,* used first by Fleance and then twice by Banquo, and with a slightly different shade of meaning each time. If I am correct in this the pun would offer a possible motivation for Banquo's giving the boy his sword. The real point of the "There's husbandry (thrift) in heaven" pun would then be the reference of *that,* in "Take thee that, too." Banquo, referring to the sky, has said, "There's husbandry (thrift) in heaven; their candles are all out." Then, to his son, he adds, "Take thee that, too." Does he not mean, as any other father would mean, "Take (or accept) that lesson on thrift"?

WM. STAPLETON LONG.

State Teachers College,
East Radford, Va.

REGRETS

The editor hereby expresses his great regret that inadvertently Professor Shaaber's little essay on a passage in *1 Henry IV* was printed in our last issue before it had been proofread. The dozen or so printer's errors are being corrected in the reprints.

SHAKSPERE ILLUSTRATED

The illustration of Shakspere's plays is not an easy matter. It needs no ghost come from the grave to tell us this. The would-be illustrator must saturate himself with the play, the emotional quality of the scene and the situation, the form and pressure of the characters (their age, their nationality, their physique, their race), the stage-setting or environment, and the costuming. Researches in psychology, archæology, history, architecture, music, folklore, etc., are almost inevitably necessary before the artist may venture to pictorialize what Shakspere has put into words. But these studies may, after all, result in nothing of the slightest value or interest if the artist is not also a poet. A real illustrator of Shakspere must also be a great actor. In other words, he must be capable of feeling and interpreting Shakspere's dreams, the products of his fantasy.

Mr. Edward A. Wilson, one of America's foremost illustrators, is such an artist. He has recently completed a series of twelve charming and exceedingly colorful paintings depicting significant moments in twelve of Shakspere's best-known plays. The scenes chosen were picked from a list which had been prepared by Professor Lyman Kittredge and include *The Taming of the Shrew* (III, ii), *Hamlet* (I, v), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (II, i), *Julius Caesar* (II, ii), *King Lear* (V, iii), *Richard III,* (II, i), *1 Henry IV* (II, iv), *As You Like It* (III, ii), *Macbeth* (I, iii), *Twelfth Night* (II, iii), *Romeo and Juliet* (I, v), and—in our opinion the best of the series—*Anthony and Cleopatra* (I, iii).

The Ketterlinus Litho Manufacturing Company of Philadelphia have beautifully reproduced Mr. Wilson's paintings in twelve full color prints (17¾ x 18¼ inches each, on fine plate paper, with wide margins) and are planning to market them in an attractive portfolio for one dollar for the set. The pictures will be loose in the portfolio so that as many of them may be framed as the owner may desire.

Lovers and teachers of Shakspere, and those who love interesting and beautiful pictures, alive and colorful, are advised not to fail to order a set when they receive the publisher's circular. To enable our readers to judge whether our enthusiasm is justified we shall print a reduced (!) facsimile in colors in our next issue.